

# *The* HISTORICAL BULLETIN

---



*See page 12*

LOYALISTS AND  
THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

William L. Lucey

THE CRITICAL PERIOD: 1750-1775

Thomas P. Neill

A KEY PROBLEM OF  
PRINCE GALLITZIN'S BIOGRAPHY

Max Fischer

CLUNIAN WOMEN

F. J. Aspenleiter

THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

Robert A. Graham

---

CORRESPONDENCE

RUSSIA AND WORLD PEACE

Joseph S. Brusher

George H. Dunne



Vol. XXIV

November • 1945

No. 1

25 cents a copy

\$1.00 a Year



# The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY  
for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XXIV

NOVEMBER, 1945

No. 1

Editor: JOHN F. BANNON

Managing Editor: JOHN M. GINSTERBLUM

Business Editor: WALTER E. BROWN

## Associate Editors

EDMUND H. HEDGES  
EDWARD J. STHOKAL  
WILLIAM H. STEINER  
DONALD R. CAMPION

WALTER H. HALLORAN  
FRANCIS J. O'BRIEN  
MARSHALL B. WINKLER  
ORVILLE J. CATUSO

## Advisory Editors

MARTIN P. HARNEY  
THOMAS F. MAHER  
CHARLES H. METZGER

W. PATRICK DONNELLY  
PETER M. DUNNE  
GERALD G. WALSH

Published quarterly in November, January, March, and May by the Missouri Province Educational Institute, St. Louis University, St. Louis 3, Mo. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932 at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on January 20, 1933. Address communications to the Managing Editor or to the Business Editor, *The Historical Bulletin*, 221 North Grand Blvd., St. Louis 3, Mo. *The Historical Bulletin* is indexed in the *Catholic Bookman* and *The Catholic Periodical Index*.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE LOYALISTS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION . . . . .	3
<i>William L. Lucey</i>	
THE CRITICAL PERIOD . . . . .	5
<i>Thomas P. Neill</i>	
A KEY PROBLEM OF PRINCE GALLITZIN'S BIOGRAPHY . . . . .	7
<i>Max Fischer</i>	
CLUNIAC WOMEN . . . . .	9
<i>F. J. Aspenleiter</i>	
THE MOOD OF THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE . . . . .	11
<i>Robert A. Graham</i>	
RUSSIA AND WORLD PEACE (Correspondence) . . . . .	12
<i>Joseph S. Brusher</i> <i>George H. Dunne</i>	
RECENT BOOKS IN REVIEW . . . . .	20

## CONTRIBUTORS

WILLIAM L. LUCEY, S.J. is Chairman of the Department of History and Political Science at Holy Cross College. He made his doctorate studies at Georgetown University, and has written for the *Catholic Historical Review*, *The New England Quarterly*, *America*, and for this *Bulletin*.

THOMAS P. NEILL is Assistant Professor of History at St. Louis University. He has just published a history of the peace problem, *Weapons for Peace*.

MAX FISCHER was for ten years foreign editor of the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, Berlin. He received his Doctorate in modern history from the University of Heidelberg, and since 1935 has lived in the United States, contributing to German-American periodicals and to *The Commonwealth*.

ROBERT A. GRAHAM, S.J. is Head of the Research Department of the Institute of Social Order, and is an associate of the *America* staff.

F. J. ASPENLEITER, S.J. took his Master's degree from St. Louis University.



# Loyalists and the American Revolution

William L. Lucey, S. J., Ph.D.

Holy Cross College

OLIVER WISWELL is a charming character, quick to win the sympathy of his audience and primed to take advantage of that sympathy.<sup>1</sup> Historians have long admitted that it was unfair to condemn the Loyalists of the American Revolution as a group and have granted them their day in court. There were conscientious men among them, and Oliver Wiswell is within his rights in stressing this truth; there were scoundrels, too, even though Oliver apparently did not recognize them. But our sympathy for his plight is more than strained by his brutal indictment of all the colonists, both leaders and rank and file, who declared and fought for independence, by his constant reference to them as boors, yokels, and poltroons, and by his stubborn conviction, in the year 1940, of the fundamental idiocy of that fight for freedom.

Long before Wiswell told his story historians had succeeded in passing a solid and fair judgment on the Loyalists. Anyone inclined to sympathize unwisely with Wiswell and his cause can profitably review some of their conclusions.

## *The Loyalists Become a Party*

As a rule John Adams is a reliable source of information on persons and events of the revolutionary period. But his explanation of the origin of the Loyalists as a party can not be accepted. When he was importuned by a friend to explain away the bitter division among the colonies on the eve of the revolution, Adams traced it all to a clever political machine which, with British gold, promises of promotion, appeals to avarice and ambition, and threats of disgrace, seduced and deluded a formidable section of the people. In 1765 the colonies were spontaneously and unanimously united against the new policy of Parliament. But then a group of men of wide influence in their communities, under the inspiration of Pitt, organized a party in favor of Great Britain. Before the patriots realized what was happening, this sordid group had nearly one-third of the inhabitants under their control.<sup>2</sup>

The exact opposite is nearer the truth. The patriots were the first to organize and mould a disciplined group, and the final success of the revolutionary cause can in large part be credited to this group. Not until the year 1774, not until the commercial war had failed and a real war threatened, can one speak with any accuracy of a Loyalist party.<sup>3</sup>

A few future Loyalists did criticize from the beginning any opposition to Parliament's new policy, but the great

majority throughout the colonies joined in the resistance to the innovations.<sup>4</sup> There were, of course, plenty who looked with disfavor on the violence attending these protests; but few, if any, perceived the seeds of independence in these protests simply because there was no necessary connection between protests and independence, and the leaders of the opposition to the innovations disavowed any such intentions. There is an abundance of evidence, private, public and official statements, to show that "up to the assembling of Congress the vast majority of the people neither contemplated independence, nor were in condition to assert or safely contend for it."<sup>5</sup>

The tea parties late in the year 1773 opened the eyes of the conservatives and the propertied class. Here was destruction of property. The rumblings of revolution and a war for independence could be heard as the tea parties were at work. A large section of the people now started to withdraw from the movement; open resentment of the methods used to compel Parliament to mend its ways were openly voiced; writers began to argue against the full implications of such opposition: a party was being cradled. When the first Continental Congress had convened and had drafted a program, the party developed quickly to maturity. Every prominent person in the colonies was confronted with an alternative; he had to take sides. And clever, vigorous writers contended with arguments and abuse to win the neutrals and the indifferent.

The first stirrings, then, of independence were also the stirrings of parties and civil strife in the colonies. During the interval between the tea parties and the sessions of the first Congress we may safely say the Loyalist party was born.<sup>6</sup>

## *Social and Intellectual Position of the Loyalists*

Neither party observed any limits in their battle of defamation. The patriots really tarred and feathered the good name and at times the well-groomed bodies of the Loyalists. They went back to original sources to find the first meaning of the word Tory, discovered that it meant an Irish highwayman "who lived on

<sup>4</sup> Moses Coit Tyler, *The Literary History of the American Revolution 1763-1783* (New York: G. P. Putnam's, 1897), I, 70-80, for the first loyalist pamphlet (1764). Tyler's work is a classic in the field. In five chapters (13-17) of the first volume will be found the arguments and sermons of the Loyalists; in chapters 27-29 of the second volume material on the literary warfare of the Loyalists is given. Notice how Loyalist Oliver Wiswell talks like his ancestors.

<sup>5</sup> George E. Ellis, "The Loyalists and their Fortunes," in *Narrative and Critical History of America*, ed. by Justin Winsor (Boston: Houghton and Mifflin, 1884-1889), VII, 192. This is an old but still useful cooperative work: Ellis has two chapters in this volume on the Revolution and the Loyalists. See also Curtis P. Nettels, *The Roots of American Civilization* (New York: F. S. Crofts, 1938), pp. 648-649.

<sup>6</sup> Nettels, *op. cit.*, p. 651; John C. Miller, *Origins of the American Revolution* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1943), pp. 460-461.

<sup>1</sup> Kenneth Roberts, *Oliver Wiswell* (New York: Doubleday, Doran & Company, 1940).

<sup>2</sup> Charles Francis Adams (ed.), *The Works of John Adams* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1856), X, 192-193. Letter to Dr. J. Morse, December 22, 1815. (Hereafter, *The Works of John Adams*).

<sup>3</sup> Claude H. Van Tyne, *The War of Independence American Phase* (Boston: Houghton and Mifflin, 1929), p. 22.



plunder" and was capable of any "villanous enterprise"; with this as a starting point they proceeded to deprive all Loyalists of any share of decency and humanity. The Loyalists were not silent either. They considered the patriots despots of low origin and mean character, upstarts, nobodies, political hypocrites and knaves.<sup>7</sup> They used much the same language as Oliver Wiswell did. If we believed the literature of this period, we would have to conclude that the English colonies were harboring a good deal of the world's dregs of humanity on the eve of the revolution. A glance at the social status, the intellectual achievements, and the religious affiliations of the Loyalists does not permit any collective condemnation. But their social and intellectual and economic background will reveal a major reason for their decision to remain loyal to the king.

The most striking characteristic of the Loyalist as a class was the large number who were not born in the colonies. A majority, possibly two-thirds, of those who declared for the king were not Americans.<sup>8</sup> That new spirit and growing conviction that the colonials were Americans, that they had reached manhood and were ready to cast off the leading-strings of their motherland, had not entered their blood. This group of Loyalists, moreover, had positions which kept them immune from this new enthusiasm since they were members of the official class, the civil and military officers of the crown. They and their families and friends were extremely disliked by the patriots and received a good share of verbal abuse, for they were "the hireling prostitutes" of "abandoned ministers" sent to enforce tyrannical acts.

The loyalty of this official group and their friends to the crown is not difficult to understand. Their future depended on that loyalty, and if they planned a permanent residence on this side of the Atlantic it was conditioned on the maintenance of the colonial status. They were not interested in independence, but their children undoubtedly would have a different attitude. A sister of one of these officials has left us some letters written in Boston during the turbulent years of 1768-1775, and it is indeed surprising to see how quickly she, and in a way her brother, became attached to the soil of the new world. With pride she writes about her new home and small farm; she admits the advantages of Boston and vicinity despite the east wind; she does not hesitate to call her nephew, born after his father's arrival in Boston, an American.<sup>9</sup> However, they were openly opposed to the cause of the patriots, and once the first shot was fired neither expected nor received much consideration. This official class was not, of course, exclusively English-born, for it was part of the British

policy to attract Americans to their ranks. And this class was limited in numbers, but their ranks were strengthened by other non-American Loyalists from other groups in the colonies with strong sympathies for the crown and parliament.

The crown received considerable support from a group that may be called the "aristocracy of culture"—the well educated, the socially prominent, and to some degree the professional classes. One can grossly exaggerate in estimating the number of Loyalists among this group, as, for instance, Oliver Wiswell does when he states that mighty few men of property and education were on the side of the rebels. The members of the early Congresses and the signers of the Declaration of Independence were not "yokels" and "poltroons". Yet north of the Mason and Dixon line many from this group of solid citizens were Tories openly or at heart, and the number of graduates from colonial colleges among the Loyalists was surprisingly high. There were sixty Harvard alumni among the 310 persons banished by Massachusetts in 1778.<sup>10</sup> Twenty percent of this one group were sons of one college, and that college was by no means the only one that contributed to the ranks of the Tories.

There were other groups, too, that generally sympathized with the royal cause: the wealthy merchants, certain religious bodies, the conservatives, and those individuals who figured that the appeal to arms had no chance for success and accordingly played safe. Every rank and class had its Tories, some more than others; the groups mentioned here were the more important ones. As we shall see they had their reasons for their loyalty. Some of them can be roundly condemned for their actions, but that censure should be reserved for and restricted to them. Many had contributed much to the making of the colonies what they were on the eve of the revolution. They had helped to place the colonies in the position where they could separate from England, and among them was "a considerable portion of the most refined, thoughtful, and conscientious people in the colonies".<sup>11</sup>

### *Motives of the Loyalists*

The British commission investigating the loyalty of the Tory Joseph Galloway was told by General Howe that one or more of four motives decided the choice of the American Tories: self-interest, resentment, gratitude and the dictates of principles.<sup>12</sup> Howe was a disappointed man when he appeared before this commission, and it is reasonable to suppose that he had not forgotten Galloway's unfavorable criticism of his conduct of the war; yet he was honest enough to admit that there were men of honor and principle among the Loyalists.

It would be easy to explain the choice of the American Tories by the economic motive, but men like

(Please turn to page thirteen)

<sup>7</sup> Frank Moore, *Diary of the American Revolution from Newspapers and Original Documents* (New York: Charles Scribner, 1890), I, 7-8; 19. These two volumes are a valuable collection of contemporary writings arranged in chronological order. See also Tyler, *op. cit.*, II, 56 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Claude H. Van Tyne, *The Loyalists in the American Revolution* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1902), p. 303. This volume is one of the best on the subject. Van Tyne has based his conclusion on an examination of the claims submitted by loyalists to Great Britain.

<sup>9</sup> Anne Hulton, *Letters of a Loyalist Lady* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), pp. 32-35 and *passim*.

<sup>10</sup> Moses C. Tyler, "The Loyalists in the American Revolution," *American Historical Review*, I (October, 1895), 24-25; Ellis, *op. cit.*, VII, 195; Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 486.

<sup>11</sup> Tyler, *The Literary History of the American Revolution*, I, 31; Van Tyne, *The Loyalists*, p. 22.

<sup>12</sup> Ellis, *op. cit.*, VII, 193. See also Lorenzo Sabine, *Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American, with an Historical Essay* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1864). A pioneer work on the subject these two volumes are a mine of information.



# The Critical Period

Thomas P. Neill, Ph.D.

St. Louis University

ALTHOUGH historians insist that the world takes no sharp turns, they do agree that there are "critical periods" wherein a civilization seems to hesitate before a fork in the road and to debate with itself before choosing one alternative or another. Such a "critical period," perhaps the most critical of modern history, was the middle of the eighteenth century. For in that period "Liberal" argued against "Conservative," the victory of the "Liberal" group being labelled "the Intellectual Revolution." Since that time European civilization has travelled in a straight line—in the direction pointed out by the eighteenth-century liberal, down a path first trod hesitantly by the Benevolent Despot, then by the bourgeoisie, boldly at first and timidly later, and now rushed down daringly by the vanguard of the proletariat.

From the standpoint of its effect on our own day, the eighteenth century is of even greater critical importance than either the Renaissance or the Protestant Revolt. For these movements had largely spent their force by the eighteenth century: the anarchic individualism of the Renaissance had been harnessed for national purposes by the despots of the later sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries; the bitter religious wars had subsided and confessional lines had been stabilized. The ideals of the Renaissance and the Protestant Revolt—such as they were—had been sacrificed for peace and security. Religion had become pretty much a department of state everywhere, and the individual was the passive subject of his divinely appointed ruler.

But in the eighteenth century the bourgeois class, the class which had promoted both the Renaissance and the Protestant Revolt and secured therefrom a taste of power and fame, rose once again to make a bid for full control of European civilization. This class rebelled against established things. State and Church were attacked between the covers of books, first obliquely and then directly, first in England, then in France and finally in the other countries of Europe. A new concept of the State and a new concept of God did battle with the old—and pretty delapidated—concepts held by supporters of the absolute ruler. With the intellectual revolution accomplished and the old idols destroyed, the middle class erected its new idols on the vacated pedestals in men's minds and hearts.

## English Beginnings

The impetus for the European intellectual revolution was furnished by the bloodless Whig revolution of 1689 in England and its subsequent glorification by English writers. Most important among these was John Locke who, ironically, by pleading in defense of the recently established order in England became the father of revolution on the continent. His famous contract theory of government<sup>1</sup> became the basis for middle class at-

<sup>1</sup> This theory is contained in Locke's *Two Treatises of Government*. In his first treatise Locke attacked Filmer's *Patriarcha*, a defense of royal rule by divine appointment. In the second treatise, "Of Civil Government," he set out to answer Hobbes'

tacks upon arbitrary rule not sanctioned by "the people." His sensist psychology, a healthy but clumsy attack on Descartes' theory of innate ideas, opened the road to the complete sensism and materialism of such Frenchmen as Condillac, LaMettrie, Holbach and Diderot, the positivism of Comte, and that group of more recent thinkers grouped under such terms as "environmental determinism" and "materialism."<sup>2</sup>

A group of Locke's immediate disciples furnished additional ammunition for future revolutionists with their amorphous theories of moral sentimentalism. These men<sup>3</sup> severed morality from religion and from objective reality by setting up the new norm of social approbation, or of personal feeling, as the standard for judging good and evil. Either forgetting or denying the all-important historical fact of original sin, they postulated a man who was essentially good and, because they were in control of social and political life in England, they could conclude that viewed from a timeless pinnacle "whatever is, is right."<sup>4</sup>

Respecting Man, whatever wrong we call,  
May, must be right, as relative to all.

And finally there was the "incomparable Mr. Newton."<sup>5</sup> A genius in mathematics and physics, Newton raised natural science to the level of a cultural force in the modern world. His method, valid in the field where he used it, was soon applied to the social sciences, to philosophy and even to theology. Choosing pragmatic serviceability over philosophic clarity, he "produced that empiricalization of rationalism which is so characteristic of the Enlightenment."<sup>6</sup>

In England these new modes of thought were not dangerous, for the transfer of wealth and power to the rising middle class had already occurred. The new theories, then, were used to justify an accomplished fact. But in France they served a much different purpose, as they did elsewhere on the continent at a later date. For there they were enlisted by the bourgeois intellectuals as weap-

*Leviathan*. Here Locke fails, typically, to come to grips with Hobbes, but his own contribution to the contract theory of government proved most influential.

<sup>2</sup> George Santayana says of Locke: "Father of psychology, father of the criticism of knowledge, father of theoretical liberalism, god-father at least of the American political system, of Voltaire and the Encyclopedia, at home he was the ancestor of that whole school of polite modern opinion which can unite liberal Christianity with mechanical science and with psychological idealism."—*Some Turns of Thought in Modern Philosophy* (New York, 1933), p. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Shaftesbury, Hutcheson, Bolingbroke and Pope are perhaps the most influential of these theorists. Richardson and Sterne, however, did more to popularize moral sentimentalism than did any of the non-fiction writers.

<sup>4</sup> Alexander Pope, *Essay on Man*. This is only a rhythmic statement of Shaftesbury's position—deistic, homocentric, sentimentalist, and full of illogical compromises.

<sup>5</sup> The phrase is Locke's. In another place he observed: "Mr. Newton is really a very valuable man, not only for his wonderful skill in mathematics, but in divinity too, and his great knowledge in the Scriptures, wherein I know few his equals."—Quoted by Thomas Fowler, *Locke* (New York, 1880), p. 117.

<sup>6</sup> Benjamin Ginzburg, "Sir Isaac Newton," *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, XI, 370.



ons for attacking political, social and ecclesiastical institutions which had till then withstood the timid attacks of the rising middle class. To the French intellectual England was the ideal country. He visited England<sup>7</sup> and there he saw what he wanted to see; he corresponded with Englishmen and marvelled at their perspicacity.<sup>8</sup> Voltaire, for example, could exclaim: "Pope's *Essay on Man* seems to me the finest didactic poem, the most useful, the most sublime, that was ever written in any tongue."<sup>9</sup> He could comment enthusiastically on Locke at least twenty times, and Diderot could assert: "Locke's philosophy, compared with that of Descartes or with that of Malebranche, is history compared to fiction."<sup>10</sup> Dorat-Cubières voiced the common French opinion when he said: "Richardson moves me far more than the tragedies of the divine Racine."<sup>11</sup>

Attempts were made in France to copy these ideal English institutions. Lafayette would complain during the Revolution that some Frenchmen "tried to give us a constitution à la Anglaisé." Mirabeau had advocated copying English hospitals and the English militia system; he had Romilly's work on the English Parliament translated into French for the enlightenment of the Constituent Assembly. The Physiocrats and other economists established "English farms" in France, and they even went so far as to organize societies for "the emulation of English institutions."

But English ideas and institutions, when transplanted into France, took on a much more radical coloring. The theoretical deism of English thinkers naturally came to be directed against the Catholic Church in France, which, by its very nature, was not elastic enough to unfold deism, theism and a belief in Christ's redemption of mankind, as could the Anglican church. The theory of the social contract, used in England to justify the "Glorious Revolution," was used in France to justify an as yet unaccomplished revolution. Brissot's comment of the effect of the *Courrier's* account of Parliamentary debates typifies how comparatively harmless English institutions took on a revolutionary tone in France: "By it they learned to know Fox, Burke, North, whose speeches they repeated . . . Everyone was astonished that George allowed himself to be insulted by them. Men said: 'What! no *lettres de cachet*! No Bastille! That's where the people are king!'"<sup>12</sup>

Frenchmen, moreover, were not capable of transplanting English ideas without modifying them in the process. Montesquieu and Voltaire are classic examples of Frenchmen who failed to understand the English in-

stitutions they described for their French readers. Most translators of English works produced French adaptations rather than faithful translations and thus, as Mornet observes, they left out of Swift all those ingredients which made him Swift, and those parts of Shakespeare which are truly Shakespearian are left untranslated. Omission was sufficient to alter the tone of English works, but frequently positive alterations were made. Voltaire's translation of Hamlet's soliloquy illustrates the point. In Shakespeare there is no attack on the goodness or existence of God, but Voltaire has him cry:

"Cruel gods, if there be any gods, enlighten my heart." Shakespeare's Hamlet utters no such complaint as does Voltaire's:

"Who would bless the hypocrisy of our lying priests?" Nor does Hamlet complain in Shakespeare's original play of doubt which

" . . . of a warlike hero makes a timid Christian."<sup>14</sup>

Thus in the hands of French intellectuals the comfortable English compromises of Locke and his associates were pushed to revolutionary conclusions. Locke's modified sensism became Condillac's absolute sensism and resulted in the materialism of a Holbach or a La-Mettrie. English deism, in the hands of Diderot and his followers, became atheism.<sup>15</sup> Locke's social contract, in Rousseau's hands, became the justification of either totalitarian rule or perpetual anarchy—depending on which interpretation one makes of the *Contrat Social*. Locke's pre-political but social natural man became in Rousseau's hands an ante-social, perfect man who has been made wicked by social institutions.

#### *The French Enlightenment*

Although the impetus for the Enlightenment came from England, the movement became primarily a French revolution within French minds and hearts. It was a revolution that can conveniently be divided into two phases: 1) the destructive, in which old institutions were levelled through the use of withering ridicule, satire and logic, sometimes good and sometimes absurdly bad; 2) the constructive, in which a new religion, a new morality, a new man and a new society were all created on paper and made ready to step on the stage of the French Revolution. These two phases were intertwined, of course, and frequently the same men both destroyed and

(Please turn to page fifteen)

<sup>14</sup> The translation used here is that of Thomas R. Lounsbury, *Shakespeare and Voltaire* (New York, 1902).

<sup>15</sup> It is very difficult to discover from Diderot's writings what he really believed. Not a brave man and certainly not rash, his fear of the censorship caused him to come to orthodox conclusions in all his articles on religious or philosophical subjects in the *Encyclopédie*. But in other articles, less likely to be examined by theological censors, and especially in such uncensored writings as his letters he shows himself to be an atheist in later life. Even in his youthful *Pensées philosophiques* he writes: "What is God? A question we put to children, on which philosophers have much trouble answering. We know the age at which a child ought to learn to read, to sing, to dance, to begin Latin or geometry. It is only in religion that you take no account of his capacity. He scarcely hears what you say before he is asked, What is God? It is at the same instant, from the same lips, that he learns that there are ghosts, goblins, werewolves—and a God."—*Oeuvres*, (Paris, 1875), I, 138.

Later on Diderot wrote against the deist argument for God's existence from design. In a letter to Voltaire, he told him that order in the universe was "a metaphysical entity existing only in your mind."—*Oeuvres*, XIX, 421.

<sup>7</sup> Almost every French writer of this period visited England at least once. Montesquieu, Voltaire, Helvetius, Morellet, Raynal, Holbach and Rousseau are only some of the better known visitors to England.

<sup>8</sup> Englishmen were looked upon as the most advanced thinkers in the world. And their achievements were attributed to the great freedom of discussion allowed in England—and to the English system of government by "contreforces."

<sup>9</sup> *Lettres sur les Anglais*. Cited by John Morley, *Diderot and the Encyclopedists* (New York, 1878), p. 42.

<sup>10</sup> *Oeuvres* (Paris, 1875), XV, 529.

<sup>11</sup> Cited by Daniel Mornet, *French Thought in the Eighteenth Century* (translated by Lawrence M. Levin, New York, 1929), p. 118.

<sup>12</sup> Cited by C. H. Lockett, *The Relations of French and English Society (1763-1793)* (London, 1920), p. 73.

<sup>13</sup> *Mémoires*, I, 281. In *ibid.*, p. 77.



# A Key Problem of Prince Gallitzin's Biography

## Max Fischer, Ph.D.

New York City

SEVERAL books and a great many articles have been written on Prince Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin, the Russo-German prince who became the "Apostle of the Alleghenies." The greatest problem of his life story is, however, still very much controverted. Did the prince himself come to America for a temporary stay, in lieu of the customary educational *grand tour*, then quite impossible in troubled Europe, or with the intention of becoming an American missionary?

It is to the credit of Dr. J. C. Plumpe, of the Catholic University of America, to have drawn attention—for the first time—to certain documents that seem to favor the second version.<sup>1</sup> Count Friedrich Leopold zu Stolberg, famous German author, whose conversion to the Catholic Church in 1800 became a sensation among the German intelligentsia, and his wife Sophia were good friends of both the young prince and Gallitzin's mother, Princess Amalia. The Stolbergs, while still Protestants, had become impressed by the Catholic piety of the Muenster circle, before they set out, in June 1791, on a journey through Italy, where they remained until the close of the following year. The influence of Princess Amalia and her Catholic friends and the impressions of this Italian trip certainly were important milestones along their way to conversion. Plumpe has taken cognizance of a letter Count Stolberg wrote to the princess from the Island of Ischia, under date of August 28, 1792<sup>2</sup>—ten days after the young prince had embarked from Rotterdam and precisely two months before his arrival in Baltimore. Referring in this letter to Gallitzin's voyage, Stolberg quoted some lines from Klopstock's famous epic, *The Messias*, in praise of the missionary's opportunity to make converts. These same verses had been employed on a previous occasion by one of Stolberg's sisters when she bade farewell to a missionary leaving for foreign lands.

From this letter of Count Stolberg one is inclined to draw the conclusion that he was convinced that young Gallitzin had left Europe in order to be a missionary. This impression is confirmed by a brief note Stolberg's wife wrote Princess Amalia three days later, in which she thanks her for a "beautiful letter" and states in a matter-of-fact manner that "the pious young man now has become a laborer in God's vineyard." Countess Stolberg was so certain that Prince Gallitzin was strengthened by his mother in his resolution to become an American missionary, that she wrote to the princess: "I admire from the depth of my soul dear Augustine's resolve and your own."

### Gallitzin's "Autobiography"

Unfortunately these letters by the Stolbergs stand in complete contrast with most other documents. First

of all, there is the so-called *Autobiography* of Gallitzin, published by Heyden—partly in the full text and partly in quotations.<sup>3</sup> In this document Gallitzin states clearly that when he landed in Baltimore, he "had nothing in view but to pursue my journey through the States, and to qualify myself for my original vocation, the profession of arms." Professor Plumpe is aware of this contradiction and, without implying that the "*autobiography*" is undeserving of credence, he gives expression to some skepticism by writing: "Has anyone other than Father Heyden ever seen the *Autobiography*? Father Heyden himself, it is evident, had not received it from Father Gallitzin directly." I must confess that this particular point of Dr. Plumpe's article impressed me very much, inasmuch as even before it was written, I had come to the conclusion—for merely stylistic reasons—that the autobiography showed traces of a foreign diction and for its larger part could stem from a lawyer's pen but not from that of a theologian. That two authors, or writers, actually cooperated on the autobiography, becomes further probable from a formal discrepancy: the document is written in the third person, while in two places (pp. 41 and 178) the first person remains.

The co-author of the so-called autobiography was presumably either the Russian ambassador to Washington, Baron Tuyll, who in 1824 helped Prince Gallitzin in phrasing a petition to Czar Alexander I, or the Russian consul and *chargé d'affaires*, Baron von Maltitz, who, in a note to the autobiography, testified that according to his investigations the quoted letters and documents were in true accordance with the originals. Both of these actions represented services of friendship and were not official routine work, since as early as 1802 Gallitzin had become an American citizen, and the documents examined were written not in Russian but in French and German.

This approbation of Baron Maltitz is dated as of January, 1827, and it is to be supposed that the "autobiography" had been written before that date. On the other hand, it could not possibly have been written before 1824, as it mentions the death on December 16, 1823, of Gallitzin's sister, and her last will. I believe that I have another clue concerning the genesis of the autobiography: Among the scanty remains of Gallitzin's papers in the archives of St. Francis College, Loretto, Pennsylvania, to which I had access, was a copy of the statement of his Baltimore banker, that Gallitzin had received money from Russia only in 1822. This document, dated January 26, 1827, implies that the prince-priest, pressed by his creditors, had not received any funds during the period between 1823 and 1827 and that he had expected to receive certain monies. Gallitzin probably meant to use this statement as a supplement to his autobiography, as proof for his creditors

<sup>1</sup> "Father Gallitzin's Vocation" in *The Catholic University Bulletin*, XI (May, 1944), 6 f.

<sup>2</sup> Fürstin Amalie von Gallitzin: *Briefwechsel und Tagebücher*, ed. by C. Schlueter (Muenster in W. 1874-76), vol. I, 100 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Thomas Heyden: *A Memoir of the Life and the Character of the Rev. Prince Demetrius A. de Gallitzin* (Baltimore, 1869).



that owing to the non-arrival of the Russian payments due him he could not fulfill his financial obligations.

The purpose of the whole so-called "autobiography" cannot have been other than to arouse the sympathy of the prince's creditors and to appease them; for nine-tenths of it treats of his financial affairs and contains nothing that concerns his priestly labors. If one accepts the Stolberg version that Gallitzin came to America with the intention *ab initio* of becoming a missionary, then one must suppose that his collaborator in the Russian embassy thought the other version—the account of his change of mind after his arrival in Baltimore—would appeal more to his creditors. But there is one more difficulty: we find the second version confirmed in documents written prior to and after the "autobiography."

*Can the Stolbergs have Erred?*

In the face of the conformity of these documents it is, of course, an extremely simple solution to ignore the Stolberg version; as Daniel Sargent does in his recent biography of Gallitzin, published more than one year after Plumpe's article.<sup>4</sup> But how can we explain that the Stolbergs were personally convinced of Gallitzin's desire to become a priest if *de facto* this was not the case? Since the Stolbergs referred to Gallitzin's departure, one must conclude that they had been informed about it in advance. As Countess Sophia mentions the "beautiful letter" of Princess Amalia, the next thought is that Amalia herself was the informant. But, as we shall see later, it would be contradictory to all other statements by Princess Amalia, if she wrote that her son had the intention of becoming a missionary. Therefore only two possibilities remain: either this intention of the young prince was a fiction of Stolberg's imagination, or young Gallitzin himself entrusted them with a confidence that he kept from others.

That the Stolbergs who already had a deep admiration for all things Catholic should be much impressed with this resolution, is not astonishing. Young Gallitzin, who at the age of seventeen had been converted from the Greek Church of his father to the Catholic Church of his mother, may often have expressed the enthusiasm of an ardent convert for a priestly career. We have proof that he once aroused his "enlightened" father's indignation by confiding even to him the desire of becoming a priest.<sup>5</sup> This desire is an understandable inclination considering the experiences of the haunted soul of Princess Amalia's precocious son, who in his education had been forced to follow the hectic spiritual wanderings of his mother, from atheism and pantheism to deism, until, finally, she was brought back to the religion of her early girlhood, the Catholic Church. How must a young man growing up at the side of such an unusual mother have longed to become not only a good Catholic, but an exceptional one, and to find his peace with the world and with God! Upon his entrance into the Catholic Church he had added the

name of Augustine to his given name of Demetrius, evidently under the influence of his mother who longed to forget that once she had been the "Diotima" of the Neo-Platonist Hemsterhuis,<sup>6</sup> and who now had only one desire, to be a "Monica" to her Augustine. Because her marriage was made rather unhappy through the skepticism and libertinism of her husband, and because they lived separate lives, she attached all her hopes and affections to her only son, whose alleged weakness of will gave her much discomfort. It was her secret desire that Augustine might become "a useful instrument for the salvation of other souls."<sup>7</sup>

In the five years between her son's conversion and his departure for the New World Princess Amalia complains again and again that her son did not give her his confidence. I cannot imagine, therefore, that Augustine's father and Professor Plumpe are right in concluding that everything had been prearranged between mother and son. If this were the case, it would be strange indeed that she had informed neither her confessor, Overberg, nor her best friend, von Fuerstenberg, with whom she talked over even minor affairs concerning her children. The former was amazed by Augustine's decision when he heard of it later on; the latter considered young Gallitzin's much discussed journey to America as his "*début* into the world."<sup>8</sup> That Princess Amalia, too, believed that her son was going on a *grand tour*, becomes evident from her wish that his travelling companion, Reverend Brosius, might be allowed by Bishop Carroll to watch over her son "during the two years which he is to pass in America" and to accompany him for a time to Philadelphia, then the capital of the United States.<sup>9</sup>

But the mother's conviction that her son would come home after two years, does not exclude the possibility that the young prince went to America with the already firm intention of becoming a missionary. We know from many indications that he disliked being constantly under the supervision and correction—sometimes certainly very odd and unreasonable—of his mother and her circle of friends, and it is quite possible that he thought an enthusiast like Stolberg, who lived far away from Muenster and had a very different background, would be much more receptive to his youthful urge for self-expression than his mother, whose best qualities he learned fully to appreciate only after her death. The reactions of the Stolbergs in response to the prince's plans are so positive and precise in their letters, that it is difficult to take them merely to be a misunderstanding or a conjecture. It is therefore well worth while to examine whether or not young Gallitzin's behavior after his arrival in America is in conformity with the opinion of the Stolbergs.

*After the Arrival in Baltimore*

We know very little indeed concerning Prince Gallitzin.  
(Please turn to page eighteen)

<sup>4</sup> Daniel Sargent: *Mitri or The Story of Prince Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin, 1770-1840* (New York and Toronto, 1945). This will be found a valuable and pleasantly written book with many hitherto unused documents, but certainly not "the definitive biography."

<sup>5</sup> Peter Henry Lemcke, O.S.B.: *Life and Work of Prince Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin*, tr. by the Rev. Joseph C. Plumpe (London and New York, 1940), 89.

<sup>6</sup> Hemsterhuis designated his book "*Alexis ou de l'Age d'Or*" to *Diotima*, cf. Sargeant, op. cit., 265.

<sup>7</sup> Lemcke, op. cit. 89.

<sup>8</sup> Sarah, F. Brownson: *Life of Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin, Prince and Priest* (New York, 1873), 61.

<sup>9</sup> Letter in Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, used by Sargent, op. cit., 75.



# Cluniac Women

## F. J. Aspenleiter, S. J. M. A.

*St. Mary's College*

THE meteoric rise of the monastery of Cluny to its imposing position in the social and political as well as the religious life of Europe during the eleventh and twelfth centuries has been the subject of numerous volumes. Yet, despite the profuseness of literature concerning this great organization, one phase of its endeavors remains in almost complete obscurity—the foundation of convents for women. That there were convents of nuns existing as early as the fourth century is common knowledge, but that there were any communities of nuns professing and following the rule of St. Benedict as interpreted by the monks of Cluny few are aware. Because of the relative unimportance of these foundations for women, as evinced by the small number of convents as well as of their inmates, details relative to the life and work of these nuns is limited to a few meagre details.

Yet the work accomplished by these convents and the illustrious number of saintly women who dwelt within their walls is far out of proportion to their insignificant number. These convents were founded in an age when Christian respect for womanhood was at its lowest ebb; but despite the ardent desires of so many women of this time to flee from that world of war, rapine, and misery, havens in which they could find God and peace were pitifully few. It was in fulfillment of this need that the Cluniac convents were established. True, they were later superseded by the convents affiliated with the orders of Friars and their history from then on is a story of gradual diminution and poverty; still if we recall that these convents were all founded a century or more before the more prolific foundations of the thirteenth century, and at a time when the need for them was acute, we begin to comprehend the important part they played in the story of religious houses for women.

### *Marcigny*

In 1049, after the death of the Abbot Odilo when the monks had gathered for the election of a new abbot, Adelmannus nominated Hugh of Semur as abbot after refusing the office for himself. Hugh was then unanimously acclaimed and was consecrated sixth abbot of Cluny a short time later.<sup>1</sup> Preeminently a statesman, for sixty years Hugh guided wisely and successfully the destinies of the large and powerful organization placed in his charge. So valued was his counsel and so powerful the weight of his influence, that he was frequently found in the courts of popes, kings, and princes. Under his care not only was the spiritual life of the Cluniac houses quickened but they were enriched in the temporal order as well. Hugh died in 1109 mourned not only by his brethren but by the whole of Europe.

Still, this is not the whole picture. In the greater number of works on St. Hugh we find little more than short references to a small foundation begun by him

at Marcigny. Strangely enough, though, this small and relatively obscure foundation was perhaps dearer to him than all his other undertakings and achievements. It was the convent for nuns founded on his family estate as a sort of family project.

The numerous journeys and extensive travels necessitated by Hugh's acknowledged importance in the world of his day brought him into contact with the sad plight of so many women, especially of the upper classes, who longed to spend their lives in God's service. Hugh sadly lamented this fact, but he did not content himself with offering sympathy. In the year 1056, with the aid of the Divine Assistance and the generosity of his brother Geoffrey, then head of the House of Semur, Hugh founded in the little village of Marcigny near Semur a convent dedicated to the Holy Trinity.<sup>2</sup> The convent was begun in 1056 but was not completed till 1061, when Hermengarde, Hugh's sister, became first prioress.

Though at first small and poor, Marcigny rapidly grew and began to flourish in temporal as well as spiritual renown. Contemporary writers speak of it with great enthusiasm, liking it to a star gleaming on high with such brilliance that its light eclipses that of the others.<sup>3</sup> According to an ancient tradition preserved in the archives of Marcigny, the convent was established with a capacity for a hundred nuns; but, in fact, the number never exceeded ninety-nine, for Our Lady, under the title of "Notre-Dame Abbess", was the invisible hundredth. A seat was kept for her in chapel and a portion was set aside for her at meals; this last was then given to some poor woman.

### *Later Foundations*

Marcigny was, then, founded by Hugh as a Cluniac convent for women. Obviously, though, one convent could scarcely suffice to alleviate the widespread necessity, so gradually more houses were established under Cluniac auspices not only in France but in foreign countries as well. With what zeal did Hugh's successors carry out his parting plea<sup>4</sup> to further this work? We can gauge this only by the number of houses that were founded after his death. For some reason or reasons, the number of Cluniac convents never exceeded a meagre dozen, and the number of inmates in each, with the exception of Marcigny, rarely reached more than fifty.

Perhaps this was due to the fact that these foundations were primarily for women of the upper class; perhaps the Cluniac rule presented too difficult a way of life for the *infirmior sexus*; or perhaps, with the exception of one or other abbot, the institution of houses for women within the organization was discouraged by the Abbot of Cluny—a conjecture which seems quite plausible. A further possibility is advanced by Miss

<sup>2</sup> L. M. Smith, *Cluny in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, 121.

<sup>3</sup> J. H. Pignot, *Histoire de L'Ordre de Cluny*, II, 35.

<sup>4</sup> *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, 493 c.

<sup>1</sup> J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae*, 159, 862.



Eckenstein;<sup>5</sup> she suggests the reason may be found in the nature of the religious revival's origin. The houses of nuns had not been interfered with like the monasteries for men during the ninth and tenth centuries by the appointment of lay abbots. As a result they were more or less untouched by the consequent evils. If this be so, the falling away from regular discipline, which called for correction in so many monasteries, was not a problem of similar grave importance among the convents. The great reform movement of Cluny would, then, have little cause for interference with them.

From the list of Cluniac monasteries and convents about the year 1400 we learn that there existed six other Cluniac convents in France besides that of Marcigny.<sup>6</sup> Next in importance to Marcigny, as well as in point of time, was the convent of Lavenne founded by the renowned Peter the Venerable. It was situated near the village of Thiers, and soon rivaled its sister convent of Marcigny in the sanctity of its inmates. Some time between 1068 and 1089, there arose two Cluniac convents in Lombardy: St. Columbanus and St. Canturio. Spain also possessed a convent, that of St. Christopher de Layre situated in the diocese of Pamplona.

The *Victoria History of the Counties of England* reveals the fact that there were two Cluniac convents in England. The priory of Arthington, dedicated to St. Mary, was situated in the county of York just outside the village of Arthington.<sup>7</sup> It was founded by Peter de Arthington some time near the end of the reign of Stephen, 1135-1154, as appears from an award made about Michaelmas in a dispute between John Arthington and the prioress of the convent. The other convent, that of Delapre or St. Mary de Pratis, situated on the outskirts of the village of Northampton, according to the confirmation charter of Edward III, was founded by Simon St. Liz the Younger in the reign of Stephen.<sup>8</sup> The founder endowed the abbey lavishly, as also did Edward III. The names of three other important benefactors might also prove interesting.

Malcolm and William, Kings of Scotland, confirmed to the nuns the Church of Fotheringhay, and John de Balliol acquitted them and their tenants from suit of his court of Fotheringhay; David, brother of the King of Scotland, bestowed on them the liberty of having a cart to pick up firewood in the wood of Yardley for the necessities of the house.<sup>9</sup>

Occasional references are also found of a Cluniac community of nuns in the Holy Land, but Pignot inclines to the belief that the nuns of this convent followed the observance of the Order of Citeaux rather than that of Cluny.<sup>10</sup> Though there may possibly have been other Cluniac convents founded in later years, this seems very unlikely for there are no references at all to such foundations.

#### *Life and Customs*

Cluniac convents remained few in number and the knowledge we possess of them is proportionately small. We are forced, therefore, to draw a part of our picture of the life and customs of the nuns in the bold generaliz-

ing strokes of conjecture. Except for slight modifications, which would quite naturally arise in different houses, the picture of Marcigny can well be used to illustrate the tenor of life in the other convents.

We learn that there were at Marcigny two classes of nuns: the cloistered, who lived in common and imitated the lives of the Cluniac monks; and the recluse, who dwelt in little cells constructed within the limits of the convent and emulated the hermits.<sup>11</sup> It is doubtful, though, whether there were any recluse nuns in the other convents; in fact it is uncertain just how long this type of nun existed even at Marcigny; for, according to the personnel of Marcigny in 1640, there is no distinction made among the nuns except that of lay sister.<sup>12</sup>

Although they were to follow the rules of St. Benedict as they were observed at Cluny, still, as might be expected, Hugh laid down certain other little regulations binding on the nuns only. A few of these regulations can be garnered from the fragments of scattered sources found in the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*.<sup>13</sup> Here we learn that no novice was to be admitted to her profession before the age of twenty-one, lest by her passions and youthful instability she bring dishonor upon the community. The vows were to be taken for life, and no sister was to be accepted unless her vocation was satisfactorily assured. Cognizant of the dangers which would beset these spouses of Christ if they should venture forth from the convent, Hugh forbade his spiritual daughters ever to leave their glorious prison. It was, indeed, the severity of their cloister which was the principle feature of discipline in these Cluniac convents. The better to secure the complete enclosure of the nuns, there was attached to the convent a priory of monks who acted as the spiritual directors of the nuns and also administrators of the temporalities of the convent. Like that of the Cluniac monk, the garb of the nuns was black, and we read that

The world being dead to them, they were dead to the world, and becoming unseen by all, after their vocation they laid over their eyes and faces a thick veil like a shroud; they wore it until their death as a symbol that should forever remind them of their latter end and warn them to prepare for it.<sup>14</sup> Because of the frailty of their sex, Hugh made special concessions in the matter of food and clothing.

Another point of interest relates to the daily life of the nuns. This question must be answered in large part by conjecture. It seems probable that their rules were not materially different from those followed by the monks of Cluny, but just how much allowance Hugh made for the weaker sex cannot be determined. We will, then, assume that they followed the general order of Cluny. The monastic day was not measured so much in hours as we know them but rather in the 'hours' of the Divine Office. A solemn Mass was usually sung after Prime (an hour after dawn) and, as at Marcigny, if there were two Masses sung, the second was after Tierce. Then, too, there were litanies and other prayers at various intervals during the day. Besides this *opus Dei* the

(Please turn to page seventeen)

<sup>5</sup> L. Eckenstein, *Women Under Monasticism*, 187.

<sup>6</sup> *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, 1705 et seq.

<sup>7</sup> *Victoria History of the County of York*, III, 187.

<sup>8</sup> *Victoria History of the County of Northampton*, II, 116.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 114.

<sup>10</sup> Pignot, *op. cit.*, II, 160.

<sup>11</sup> *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, 455 c.

<sup>12</sup> F. Cucherat, *Cluny au Onzième Siècle*, 252 et seq.

<sup>13</sup> *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, 455 c. et seq., 491 c. et seq.

<sup>14</sup> Peter the Venerable, *De Miraculis*, in *Bibl. Clun.* 1280 d.



# The San Francisco Conference

Robert A. Graham, S. J.

*New York City*

The older generation of diplomats at the San Francisco Conference on International Organization found it hard to bear the light treatment they saw accorded to the old institutions. The past had lost its sanctity for the predominantly youthful gathering that met for nine weeks by the Golden Gate. For better or for worse the attitude of UNCIO was forward looking, without more than a furtive glance backwards to a past everyone wanted to forget. More than one participant commented to me that it was as though history no longer had any meaning, or more precisely, as though there were no respect for the past just because it was the past.

I believe the clue to this attitude was expressed by a distinguished historian whom I heard say at San Francisco: "We are living in a highly dynamic world far different from the static world of the past. No longer are human affairs, the destinies of nations, regulated by tradition and custom so much as by deliberate choice and reasoning." The studied, deliberate policies expressed in the Charter, the extensive authority conferred on the various organs, the broad and undefined phrases allowing for all possible contingencies of a very unpredictable world, serve to emphasize the fact that in the mind of the delegates the future will be the creation of concerted deliberate action. It will not be the result of unobserved and uncontrolled forces or of traditional protocol.

At San Francisco, when they thought of the past, they thought of it in the light of lessons learned, of mistakes to be avoided and of crimes to be atoned for. That the past is also a deposit of good things was less important, even if true. UNCIO represented a world of young men who were not too keen on keeping up the old traditions and not too sure that the former generation knew what it was doing.

This attitude can be partially explained in terms of the present political situation. Two non-European powers have now assumed leadership in international life. Neither of these states had been closely identified with the League of Nations or with the decisions of Europe's politics. The United States never joined the League and boasted that it kept its hands clean of continental intrigue. The Soviet Union has not forgotten that it was the only nation expelled from the League. At San Francisco these two powers had their own, new ideas, while Britain was struggling desperately to save what it could of its old position, and while France was too confused and divided at home to state any forthright positions abroad.

Probably our own people do not fully appreciate the all-pervading, overwhelming character of America's role at UNCIO. The American delegation was ubiquitous. Technical competence and organizational genius were fully put to use by a country possessed of a highly developed messianic sense, with the vision to conceive and the prestige to execute a far-reaching program of inter-

national cooperation. The great future envisioned by the United Nations Charter was worthy of a nation that was successfully concluding a great war waged on a dozen fronts. The United States took the initiative at the Moscow Conference, at Dumbarton Oaks and at Yalta in urging the creation of the organization. At San Francisco, time and again it was "word from Stettinius" that decided issues. Under such circumstances it was inevitable that the past, of which America had never been a part and for which it scarcely held any esteem or affection, should have been left far behind.

In a more spectacular way, though not in the all-pervasive fashion of the United States, the Soviet Union did its share in the process of cutting away from the traditions of the past. But its attitude was more than just an effort to conceal the skeleton in the closet, whether that be the pact with Hitler or the expulsion from the League. On the very first business day of the conference, when the question at issue was the election of a permanent chairman, Commissar Molotov rose to move that the chairmanship should rotate among the four sponsoring powers. South Americans still bitterly remember the stinging rebuke administered to Mexico's Ezequiel Padilla who modestly pointed out that established protocol required that the chief of the host delegation, in this case Mr. Stettinius, should be permanent chairman. Sarcastically Molotov thanked Padilla for his "lessons in diplomacy", but insisted on his original point. I well remember the observation made to me on this occasion by José Serrato, Foreign Minister of Uruguay, and head of the Uruguayan delegation. "The Russians," he said, "want us to act as if there were no past. They see a new world in the making, and they want to be its chief architects." In subsequent episodes, when precedent and protocol were raised, Russia was there to protest.

But regardless of the policies assumed by the American and Russian delegations, the spirit of the San Francisco Conference on International Organization was basically a reflection of the new trend in human governance. The pace of modern international life is much too rapid to develop unattended and uncontrolled. The mechanical formalities of past techniques and policies are inadequate to cope with the infinite variety of problems that can arise in an era so complex as the present.

If the atomic bomb had been dropped on Berlin or Tokyo during those weeks of April, May, and June, the conference would certainly have taken on clearer significance. But it would not have fundamentally altered the basic mood of the delegates who were already keenly alive to the possibilities and the dangers of the future. That this meant the almost wholesale jettisoning of the past and its ways may have been sad to the older men, such as Jan Christiaan Smuts, but in the light of modern conditions was practically inevitable.

*(Please turn to page seventeen)*



# Russia and World Peace

## Correspondence

The opinions expressed in the following communications are not necessarily those of the Editors of THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN. It is hoped that the discussion, which terminates at this point, will be of some service in clarifying the issue of international cooperation between the United States and Russia. Father Brusher's

JOSEPH S. BRUSHER, S.J.

FATHER GEORGE DUNNE'S article in the May issue of THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN raises a question which must interest all thinking souls today. Will the world be able to continue half Communist and half free? Will Soviet Russia cooperate to keep peace in a weary and war-sickened world, or will she continue an aggressor policy to keep the nations quivering in perpetual disequilibrium to crash finally into the unspeakable horrors of a new war? Father Dunne examines two fundamental issues: Stalin and world revolution, Stalin and world peace.

On the first point Father Dunne is optimistic. He places a good deal of confidence in the rupture between Trotsky and Stalin on the question of world revolution versus Communism in one country first. He then goes on to examine the further difficulty:

"... granting that Stalin has subordinated world revolution to the immediate task of building Socialism in Russia, it is still true that world revolution remains the ultimate goal even in Stalin's thinking."

Father Dunne answers this difficulty by saying:

"... it will take some generations before the primary goal of Socialism in Russia can be fully realized. Much can happen in the meantime."

Now this is a good argument for the appeasers. Since no one wants a war, let us continue appeasing Soviet Russia and hope that, gorged with conquest, the leopard will change its spots. There is some reason in this all right, but we could draw much more consolation from it, had we not seen the Nazi leopard, far from changing its spots, go on and on until—

But in dealing with this question Father Dunne shows that he is laboring under a misconception, strange indeed in one who presumes to write about Soviet Russia. Here are his words:

"Those who from a few syllogisms out of their ethics manuals have concluded so confidently that Socialism cannot work have little to fear. Yet they are usually the same ones who express the greatest fear."

This is strange! Surely Father Dunne should realize that the academic socialism of the ethics manuals or of Karl Marx for that matter, is scarcely the Socialism of the Soviet Union! Most of the evils of academic socialism are there all right, but missing are the idealist and utopian elements which make academic socialism an unworkable proposition. The most sketchy acquaintance with Russian conditions would have prevented Father Dunne from making so naive a statement.

Father Dunne's whole treatment of Russia and world peace rests upon a fundamental fallacy. This fallacy

(Please turn to page eighteen)

criticism of "Russia and World Peace" by the Rev. George H. Dunne, S.J. (May, 1945) represents the views of the small group of correspondents who disagreed with the article. In the May issue Father Dunne was erroneously listed as a member of the faculty of the University of San Francisco.

GEORGE H. DUNNE, S.J.

Thank you for offering me the opportunity to reply to Father Brusher's strictures upon my article on Russia. I cannot within the space available to me discuss every point raised by Father Brusher. The best suggestion I can make is that Father Brusher read my article more carefully than he seems to have done. However, inasmuch as no writer cares to have his views misrepresented, there are a few points which I should like to make.

Father Brusher charges me with holding that "to be disgusted and aquiver with moral indignation at the oppression of Eastern Europe is to be guilty of 'perfectionist nihilism.'" My article made perfectly clear what I meant by "perfectionist nihilism," and it had nothing to do with moral indignation or lack of moral indignation. I defined "perfectionist nihilism" as the attitude which would argue that we should "withdraw from participation in international collaboration upon the ground that in this or that respect the peace settlement has sacrificed justice to power interests." And in stating that this was an illegitimate attitude I explicitly defended the legitimacy of deprecating (or of quivering with moral indignation, if Father Brusher prefers) violations of justice in the peace settlement.

There is nothing in my article to justify Father Brusher's rather bitter suggestion that I "pooh pooh" the injustices in Eastern Europe as "a minor manifestation of the results of original sin." On the contrary, I view the injustices and the immense sufferings everywhere in Europe as a major and profoundly tragic manifestation of the results of original sin. I do not take a light view of original sin. In view of my remark about "the immensity of evil in human nature" which I said "strongly contrasts with the scarcity of good," a less emotional reading of my article by Father Brusher would have saved him from the mistake of attributing to me a cavalier attitude in this matter.

It is precisely the tragedy of a humanity that suffers, not in a minor way, but in a deeply tragic way from the consequences of original sin, that in the world of politics man is often confronted with the necessity of choosing between only two alternatives: the greater or the lesser evil. It is the realization of this fact which forms the basis of the diplomacy of the Holy See. It is possible to err, to mistake the lesser for the greater evil. It is necessary to choose.

Were the Holy See to establish tomorrow a *modus vivendi* with the Soviet regime it would imply no in-

(Please turn to page twenty)



## American Loyalists

(Continued from page four)

Peter Van Schacck rudely upset such explanations. Van Schacck, a man of admitted ability in the legal circles of New York, conscientiously argued the whole problem out with himself and concluded that he could not support an appeal to arms. His arguments were by no means weak and he was supported, he asserted, by Locke whose political writings were the inspiration of so many patriots.<sup>13</sup> For fidelity to that conclusion so painfully arrived at, Van Schacck accepted exile and many other sacrifices. Men of his calibre make it clear that not all Loyalists were seeking their own advantages when they supported the king.

One factor that divided the colonials into patriots and Loyalists has not received sufficient attention—the division along religious convictions. Religious fears and prejudices, sectarian antipathies and the influence of the clergy combined to create one of the most important causes of the rebellion and the division of the inhabitants of the colonies into two hostile camps.<sup>14</sup> Fear of episcopacy stimulated the spirit of rebellion to an incredible degree. Forty years after Lexington, when Americans had become accustomed to the presence of Anglican, Methodist, and Catholic bishops, John Adams could hardly believe that this fear of episcopacy had contributed “as much as any other cause” in uniting the colonies against parliamentary authority.<sup>15</sup>

This was especially true north of the Mason and Dixon line. In New York and in New England the split along religious lines was very plain, with the Congregationalist and the Presbyterians becoming patriots as a rule, and the Anglicans remaining loyal to the crown. Thomas McKean noted a similar division in Delaware where the Anglicans opposed and the Presbyterians favored the fight for independence. In Pennsylvania the Quakers for the most part sided with the Tories. Yet in the South the Anglicans were on the side of the planters and the revolutionary cause.<sup>16</sup>

It would be quite incorrect, however, to think that only Anglicans, Quakers, and Memonists (the third religious group on the side of the crown and parliament) were Tories. The numerical strength of these three groups will not explain the thousands who declared for the king. At the time of the revolution the colonists were strongly non-conformist in their religious views. The Catholics were an insignificant minority. The Anglicans were a significant but numerically small group; there was about one Anglican to every thirty non-conformists. Yet there was one Tory out of every three colonists. The Quakers and the Memonists did not correct this discrepancy. Clearly there were many Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and other non-conformists

opposed to the appeal to arms because of social position, economic status, or other reason.

By way of summary, then, we may say that the large official class and their friends remained loyal to the British authorities because of their self-interest, that many Anglicans and Quakers because of their religious affiliations and convictions were bolstered by the inducements of their social and economic status, and that the spirit of conservatism which does not induce men to rid themselves of prosperity restrained many from the dangers of an appeal to arms. In the Carolinas and Georgia there were those who supported the crown because their political foes were patriots. Throughout all the colonies there was the usual group of fair weather persons who wanted to be on the winning side and could not conceive of a successful struggle for independence. Many were the influences, some sordid and some honorable, struggling for the adherence of the colonists.

### *Strength of the Loyalists*

How strong was the Loyalist party? How was this strength distributed throughout the colonies, and where were the strongholds of the Loyalists? John Adams and his friend, Thomas McKean, two ardent patriots in no way inclined to be generous with the king's cause, conceded that one-third of the colonists were opposed to struggle for independence.<sup>17</sup> No exact figures can be given and Adams' estimate may be accepted as fairly accurate. But it should be remembered that the majority became secret sympathizers after independence was declared.

The religious, social, and economic factors that helped to form the party would indicate the centers of commerce, the cities and towns where conservatism prevailed, the colonies with large Anglican and Quaker populations and localities where the official class was influential as the strongholds of Loyalists. And this seems to be true.

New York and Pennsylvania, where Anglicanism and the Quakers were very strong and where commerce prospered and conservatism was deep-rooted, could be called Loyalist colonies. So strong was the party in these two areas that John Adams believed they would have “joined the British” if not awed into submission by Virginia on one side and New England on the other.<sup>18</sup> New York City, after the arrival of Howe in 1776, remained under British control until the peace treaty was signed and consequently became a camp for the Loyalist refugees. In Delaware, a majority was “unquestionably against the independence of America,” according to Thomas McKean. And although McKean denied that the majority of Pennsylvania was against the revolution, the Loyalists were the victors at the polls in the spring of 1776.<sup>19</sup>

Massachusetts also had her problem. In 1775 the Boston elections went to the patriots by a count of five to three, and this would indicate a dangerous element of trouble-makers within the home of Congregationalism. But Boston and Massachusetts solved the problem by

<sup>13</sup> Henry C. Van Schacck, *The Life of Peter Van Schacck, LL.D.* (New York: Appleton and Co., 1842), pp. 54-58.

<sup>14</sup> C. H. Van Tyne, “The Influence of the Clergy, and of Religious and Sectarian Forces on the American Revolution,” *American Historical Review* XIX (October, 1913), 64. See also Ellis, *op. cit.*, VI, 243 and Miller, *op. cit.*, pp. 186-197.

<sup>15</sup> *Works of John Adams*, X, 185. Letter to J. Morse, December 2, 1815.

<sup>16</sup> For the division along religious lines, confer Van Tyne, *The Loyalists*, p. 109; Van Tyne, *loc. cit.*, *American Historical Review*, XIX, 48; Miller, *op. cit.*, pp. 195-196.

<sup>17</sup> *Works of John Adams*, X, 110. Thomas McKean agreed, cf. *ibid.*, X, 87.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, X, 63.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, X, 81, 73-75.



being the first to legislate severely against the supporters of and sympathizers with parliament and the crown. Then the tension slackened considerably when 1,000 left with Gage on that memorable seventeenth of March in the year 1776. To make certain that the trouble would not return, two years later 310 prominent leaders of that opposition were banished.

The Bay State was not the only New England colony with disaffected citizens. Certain sections of Vermont and Connecticut manifested strong affection for the king, and in some towns of the latter colony Anglicanism was strong. But quick action by the patriots reduced the threat to impotency, and so well was the job done that this state became the prison for many eastern Loyalists who were removed by local authorities from their communities to prevent any baneful influence.<sup>20</sup>

In the South the situation was more evenly balanced; Georgia and South Carolina counterbalancing the revolutionary movements in Virginia and North Carolina. Although Virginia was as free as any colony from the poison of Toryism, there was "a large latent opposition to rebellion" which was crushed or muzzled early in the conflict and hence did not materialize.<sup>21</sup> In Georgia the situation was unfavorable to the revolution. Financial aid from Parliament and fear of the Creek Indians made them lean on England, and under the skillful management of Governor Wright this colony sent no delegates to the first Continental Congress, and he repeated his success the next year when he frustrated the efforts of the patriots to send representatives to Philadelphia.<sup>22</sup>

Although accurate figures are not available, there is no denying that there was considerable anti-independence feeling on the eve of hostilities in all the colonies. New York, Pennsylvania, South Carolina and Georgia might be called Loyalist colonies. But their full strength was never organized. Parliament seemed deliberately to ignore them, while the Loyalists awaited strong measures from abroad. Frequently they acted as if the contest was too undignified for their participation and persuaded themselves that England would handle the disturbance. Others resorted to verbal abuse and villification which makes pleasant reading today but proved to be ineffective protection at the time.

#### *The Loyalists in Exile*

The American Revolution created a refugee problem that still bulks largely in history. During and immediately after the war about one hundred thousand quitted the shores of the new republic to establish new homes somewhere in the British Empire.<sup>23</sup> This number roughly represents the prominent Loyalists, those who took an active part in the struggle or committed themselves by word or deed to the losing cause or simply exiled themselves. Those who managed to hide their allegiance,

and there must have been thousands of them, if John Adams' estimate is accepted, escaped the penalty of exile and remained to become citizens of the new nation without boasting of their contribution to independence.

The exodus started early in the struggle. They fled by the thousands whenever the British forces evacuated a city or lost control of a strategic position. One thousand accompanied Gage to Nova Scotia ("Nova Scarcity" to the patriots) from Boston in the spring of 1776; when Philadelphia was evacuated in the summer of 1778, three thousand left with the British army; during that same year and in the wake of Burgoyne's defeat another three thousand fled overland to Canada; and towards the end of the war, when Savannah and Charleston were abandoned, Loyalists to the number of ten thousand departed with the losers.<sup>24</sup>

While there was any hope of victory New York was preferred to flight outside the country. There they were secure and could indulge in dreams of a better day, and they were quite certain the king would never abandon them to their enemies. But they were bitterly disappointed. The American peace commissioners were adamant against any show of mercy towards those who had opposed independence. British authorities were well aware that an empty obligation had been assumed when the American peacemakers committed Congress to the task of recommending mercy to the several states for the Loyalists. After the treaty the real exodus began.

To England, to the British West Indies, to Canada, and to Nova Scotia they fled. There is not too much information on those who went to the Indies but probably they fared as well, if not better, than those who selected England. They did not feel at home in the mother country. The great majority, however, went to Canada and to Nova Scotia.<sup>25</sup> Some ten thousand, many of them men of high position and education, went to Nova Scotia and then decided to build on virgin soil and selected what was at the time an uncultivated part of that colony. At the mouth of the St. John's these old New Englanders soon revealed that they had not lost their old habits by moving a few degrees north, for the Treaty of Paris was not two years old when they demanded separation, not from England as the patriots had, but from Nova Scotia. They wanted to govern themselves, for they were the wise and the wealthy and the good. And they got their freedom; in 1784 they became a separate colony, and after toying with the idea of calling it New Ireland (to make the re-duplication of Great Britain complete in the new world), they compromised on New Brunswick. That is where Oliver Wiswell went, wondering in a vague way if Providence did not have plans beyond his understanding for the "rabble" he had left behind.

Considerable culture, political experience, and respectable virtues left the shores of the new nation during the exodus. But enough political wisdom remained behind to frame a remarkable constitution within fifteen years. The drain on the national strength was not disastrous.

<sup>20</sup> George A. Gilbert, "The Connecticut Loyalists," *American Historical Review*, IV (January, 1899), 287.

<sup>21</sup> Van Tyne, *The War of Independence*, p. 207.

<sup>22</sup> Peter Force, *American Archives* (4th series, Washington, 1837-1846), II, 279-280 for the letter to Congress explaining the poor showing of Georgia.

<sup>23</sup> George M. Wrong, *Canada and the American Revolution* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935), pp. 399; Van Tyne, *The Loyalists*, pp. 289, 298-299.

<sup>24</sup> Van Tyne, *The Loyalists*, pp. 59, 288, 298.

<sup>25</sup> Wrong, *op. cit.*, p. 444. The late chapters in this volume give a good picture of the exiles in Canada.



## The Critical Period

(Continued from page six)

created; but generally speaking it can be said that the destructive work came first and that Voltaire and the Encyclopedists were its leading figures. Helvetius, Holbach and the Physiocrats destroyed old ideas and methods and norms, but at the same time they proposed new systems—utilitarianism in one case and a "modernized" view of natural law in the other. However, it is Rousseau who stands forth as the giant builder of a new man, a new society, a new religion and new standards of morality.

Voltaire was a great popularizer of other men's ideas, a publicist whose power rested on his ability to turn a neat phrase. Of greater basic importance in attacking the old institutions was the group centering around Denis Diderot and his *Encyclopédie*. Diderot and his associates stated that their object was two-fold: 1) to collect and show the interrelationship of all knowledge; 2) to expose prejudices and discredit the authority on which previously held knowledge rested.<sup>16</sup>

The Encyclopedia was a skillful, vicious attack on old institutions in France, especially upon the fundamental religious, moral and philosophical system held by the Church and by the government. The attack was so skillful that the theologians who were supposed to censor the work seldom realized how deftly their beliefs were being undermined. In articles on avowedly religious or philosophical subjects Diderot carefully came to orthodox conclusions—but frequently the reader could not.<sup>17</sup> Objections to orthodox teaching were often strongly stated and weakly refuted. Another method was to state heretical or radical theories in obscure places to lead the reader to them by cross-references. Jesus, for example, is spoken of with orthodox respect in the religious articles, but in "*Théosophes*" He is called a fanatic, in "*Suicide*" it is intimated that His voluntary death was suicide, and in "*Juifs*" He is called "that absurd and fanatical Jew."<sup>18</sup>

The aim of the editors of the *Encyclopédie* is indicated in their correspondence which was free from censorship. Diderot boasts to Voltaire of exploiting the "imbecility" of the censors, and D'Alembert answered Voltaire's accusation of being orthodox thus: "No doubt we have had bad articles on theology and metaphysics; but with theologians for censors and a privilege to keep, I defy you to make them better. There are other articles, less

<sup>16</sup> These purposes are frankly stated in advance notices prepared by Diderot, in his article "*Encyclopédie*," and in D'Alembert's preliminary discourse.

<sup>17</sup> Mornet observes on this point: "The articles on the *Bible*, *Christianity*, *Infernal Punishments*, and many others rely upon the Church for the ultimate decision on the problems that are presented. But they begin by slyly presenting all these problems and the difficulties that they entail. Gradually two doctrines are disseminated, and one of them really becomes the dominant opinion among the cultivated classes . . . By skillful cross-references, by allusions, by articles which were eminently respectable but in which embarrassing problems were attacked with the utmost frankness, Diderot, Morellet and others taught men to doubt and to deny."—*op. cit.*, pp. 61 and 271.

<sup>18</sup> The best study of this subject is Joseph Edmund Barker, *Diderot's Treatment of the Christian Religion in the Encyclopédie* (New York, 1941). Barker concludes that "his principal aim . . . was that of changing by education and propaganda the common way of thinking about religion and the Church."—p. 129.

exposed to the light, where everything is repaired. Time will distinguish what we have thought from what we have said."<sup>19</sup>

For the old religion Diderot would supply either a natural religion or none at all—it is hard to tell which.<sup>20</sup> For the morality of the old religion Diderot would supply his own strange combination of moral ideas, the germs of nineteenth-century determinism, behaviorism and materialism. He rejects free will, but he manages to be both determinist and moralist. By creating good environment and having good laws, he believed, society could make man necessarily good. All knowledge and therefore all morality, which is equated with knowledge, depend on the senses.<sup>21</sup> Sense pleasure is the norm for deciding whether an act is good or bad. In his method of investigation and reasoning Diderot is positivistic, and among his conclusions he states the survival-of-the-fittest theory of evolution.<sup>22</sup>

But it was Helvetius more than Diderot who created the new code of morality in his famous *De l'esprit* and expounded it at greater length in his posthumous *De l'homme*. Since "man is a machine . . . put in motion by corporeal sensibility," "pleasures and pains are the moving powers of the universe." What produces sensuous pleasure is good; what causes physical suffering is evil.<sup>23</sup> But because men are all absolutely equal and only by education are rendered different, the right kind of laws and the right system of education will make possible the equal pleasure-happiness of all. "Virtue," therefore, "is nothing more than the desire of public happiness."<sup>24</sup>

It was Holbach, however, who completed the work of this group by coming to a very unromantic and quite dismal conclusion. Goethe spoke the opinion of many when he observed of Holbach's *Système de la nature*: "We could not conceive how such a book could be dangerous. It came to us so gray, so Cimmerian, so corpse-like, that we could hardly endure its presence; we shuddered before it as if it had been a spectre. It struck us as the very quintessence of musty age, savorless, repugnant."<sup>25</sup> But Frederick the Great considered it worthy of instant refutation, as did even Voltaire.

In this work Holbach is frankly and dogmatically ma-

<sup>19</sup> This letter of D'Alembert is cited frequently. See Barker, *op. cit.*, p. 11; or John Morley, *op. cit.*, p. 94. Morley, who sympathizes with Diderot and his group, admits: "We are constantly being puzzled and diverted by Diderot's ingenuity in wandering away from the topic in hand, to insinuate some of those doctrines of tolerance, of suspended judgment, or of liberty, which lay so much nearer to his heart than any point of mere erudition."—p. 140.

<sup>20</sup> Even though Diderot ended up an atheist, he seems to have believed in the necessity of some kind of natural religion, or perhaps a religion of virtue. He seems to have groped around on this subject without coming to a definite decision.

<sup>21</sup> This is the purpose of his "Letter on the Blind," where he concludes: "How different is the morality of the blind from ours; and how the morality of the deaf would differ from that of the blind; and if a being should have a sense more than we have, how woefully imperfect would he find our morality!"—*Oeuvres*, I, 313.

<sup>22</sup> Diderot has his blind Saunderson state the survival-of-the-fittest theory. He managed to work it into the Encyclopedia in his article on the Ethiopians by stating it as a peculiar belief attributed to them.

<sup>23</sup> *Treatise on Man, His Intellectual Faculties and His Education* (translation of *De l'homme*, by W. Hooper, London, 1777), p. 146, 156.

<sup>24</sup> Quoted by Helvetius from his *De l'esprit*, in *ibid.*, p. 238.

<sup>25</sup> Quoted in Morley, *op. cit.*, p. 343.



terialistic.<sup>26</sup> Matter is the be-all and end-all of existence. Man, therefore, has neither mind nor soul nor will. "Nature does not make man either good or wicked; she combines machines more or less active, mobile, and energetic."<sup>27</sup> Holbach denies the possibility of God's existence and concludes that religion is the opium of the people. "The regions of the world to come, have enabled the priesthood to conquer the present world. The expectation of celestial happiness, and the dread of future tortures, only served to prevent man from seeking after the means to render himself happy here below."<sup>28</sup> But with Helvetius, Holbach would preserve a morality whereby that which increases the pleasures of mankind is good and that which decreases them is wicked. His new moral code contains such advice as this: "Be just, because equity is the support of human society! . . . Be gentle, because mildness attracts attention! Be thankful, because gratitude feeds benevolence, nourishes generosity! . . . Forgive injuries, because revenge perpetuates hatred!"<sup>29</sup>

Such "liberal" onslaughts on the European Christian tradition as these won a hearing and converted thinking men largely because of the dilapidated condition of the institutions which they attacked. The political order was badly in need of modernization and reform; the Church in France suffered from Gallicanism, from internal division and from failure to clean house. The decadence of both Church and State in France is indicated by the fact that neither produced an influential leader or outstanding thinker to answer the "liberal" attacks and to rally the people behind a reform of the established order. The defenders of Church and State were frivolous and incapable, or more often just mediocre men.

#### Jean-Jacques Rousseau

There was a half-mad Genevan, however, who had tried desperately to make good as an enlightened rationalist and who, when he failed, picked up neglected weapons from the Christian camp to attack the rationalist clique. But the Holbachians had done their work of destruction. And they had cleared the way for Jean-Jacques to build an edifice which only today seems to be crumbling.

Rousseau is one of the great enigmas of history. What went on in his mind, what he meant by what he said, are still puzzles to everyone who tries to follow his tortuous mental processes. But critics and disciples of Rousseau are agreed on his importance: from him mob-rule democrats obtain their theories;<sup>30</sup> from him rugged individualists draw a defense of anarchical social and political life; from him stem modern romanticism and the pathetic trust in a good natural man unstained by original sin; from him detractors of civilization, religion, culture and all "artificial institutions" draw their

arguments; and from him, rather ironically, comes a philosophic defense of modern totalitarian government.<sup>31</sup>

Rousseau's influence is due as much to the barren rationalism of his opponents as to his own eloquence. For the unbalanced Genevan wrote for an age that shivered in a spiritual vacuum. His breath was warm in an atmosphere that was cold and haughty. He called women back to the path of virtue, and he exposed the barrenness of the Voltairean attitude toward man and God. He was a religious man, and herein lay the secret of his power. He glorified bourgeois virtues and in a cynical age he preached the gospel of patriotism. He apparently justified an absolute state as the only means of realizing one's true freedom, and Rousseau's disciples seem satisfied that he reconciled the antinomies of authority and freedom. "Whoever refuses to obey the general will," he wrote, "shall be compelled to do so by the whole body. This means nothing less than that he will be forced to be free."<sup>32</sup>

But Rousseau's superstructure of religious and social theory rested upon the shifting foundation of *sensibilité*—subjective, irrational impulse. Rousseau created his own God and his own morality, and his norm was his own impulsive feeling. "I find them (principles of right and wrong) in the depths of my heart, traced by nature in characters which nothing can efface. I need only consult myself with regard to what I wish to do; what I feel to be right is right, what I feel to be wrong is wrong."<sup>33</sup> It is on this emotionalism and subjectivism that Rousseau's romantic followers built in vain throughout the nineteenth century and into the twentieth.

The world was in need of reform—of a real revolution—in the eighteenth century. Under the absolute ruler man had been degraded to sub-human status; religion had become more and more a department of state operated in the state's interest; intellectual life and business affairs were cramped within the narrow confines of what the ruler thought beneficial to his realm—which almost always meant himself. There was need of revolution, but if European culture was to prosper and European men to live a full human existence the revolution had to be based on sound principles and guided in the right direction.

The revolutions of the eighteenth century, unfortunately for us today, were turns in the wrong direction. Old abuses were sometimes abolished, but for each old abuse abolished two or three new ones were substituted. By a revolutionary political theory the European tried to regain his importance as a human being. And he failed, for he substituted an all-powerful people for an absolute king. By an intellectual revolution he tried to

<sup>26</sup> Where Helvetius was strictly a man of one book, Holbach wrote more than twenty. But most of his works, such as *Le christianisme dévoilé*, *De l'imposture sacerdotale* and *Essai sur préjugés*, are only popularizations and restatements of sections of his *Système de la nature*.

<sup>27</sup> *The System of Nature: or, Laws of the Moral and Physical World* (translation of *Système de la nature* by H. D. Robinson, Boston, 1853), p. 2.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 127.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 334.

<sup>30</sup> It is this kind of democratic rule and theory that has been condemned by the popes since Rousseau's time. In his last Christmas message Pope Pius XII distinguished sharply between true democracy and that kind advocated by Rousseauvians.

<sup>31</sup> This is not to make Rousseau the unique source of modern thought. He was not even an innovator in his own age, for he expressed a movement quite generally in the air. Because he expressed it so well his influence was tremendous and Kant was justified in calling him the Newton of the moral order.

<sup>32</sup> *Contract social*, Book I, chapter vii, "The Sovereign."

<sup>33</sup> This is in the "Creed of a Savoyard Vicar," the famous section in *Emile* giving Rousseau's confession of faith. See *Emile or Education* (Everyman's Library Edition, 1930), p. 249.



win command over the world of ideas again. And he failed, for he ended up trying to make the world conform to his wishful thinking rather than making his mind conform to reality. By a revolution in economic theory he tried to regain human freedom in business activity. And he failed, for he replaced tyrannical control by government over business with an even more tyrannical domination by big business. The revolutions of the eighteenth century were revolutions in the wrong direction, and for a century and a half Europe was committed to following through to conclusion the choices made at that time—until today there seems to be a general revolution at work again, a reconsidering of the alternatives and a period of hesitancy before another choice is made.

## San Francisco Conference

(Continued from page eleven)

The Charter of the United Nations is a blue print for a future they felt was within our reach. Whether our own or future generations will follow this plan is, of course, an outcome to be awaited. Certainly the future will not be what we want it to be if the prevailing attitude of the world public is one of cynicism and "wait and see". If the delegates at UNCIO did not respect the sad past, neither did they dare to paint a golden future. They felt that the present day has no need of prophets, whether prophets of doom or of glory. They felt that determination was more to the point than optimism. They, or rather the peoples they represented, looked to the future not with fingers crossed but with clenched determined fists.

## Cluniac Women

(Continued from page ten)

nuns very likely spent some time in reading and perhaps even in studying or writing.

The Benedictine Rule also prescribes manual labor for an average of seven hours a day.<sup>15</sup> The mending and washing of garments, baking, cooking, and similar tasks were included under this category. However, it is doubtful whether even this type of manual labor was performed to the full extent of the rule by the nuns. Since the earlier Cluniac convents were founded especially for women of noble blood, it is more likely that the greater amount of manual labor was performed by lay sisters and domestics.

We find in a catalogue of Cluniac monasteries and converts<sup>16</sup> that there were *quindecim puellae* at Marcigny. This might refer to young ladies who had not as yet received their vows, but the comparatively large number would seem to suggest that perhaps by this time young girls were coming to these convents for the purpose of receiving an education. From a letter of Peter the Venerable<sup>17</sup> we learn that under Raingarde, his mother, and her two granddaughters, Marguerite and Ponce de Montboissier, the convent of Marcigny be-

came a center of medical and nursing skill. This is easily understood if we realize that down to the time of the 'Reformation' monasteries and convents were the centers of relief and succor for the sick, aged, and poor. The catalogue also bears witness to the help given the poor and unfortunate. Besides the alms which were to be given to all transients, some of the convents had prescribed amounts to be given on fixed days—such as Sundays and certain feast days.

One indication of an important contribution of these Cluniac nuns to the spiritual fervor of nuns in other convents is found in two brief statements hidden away in Cucherat.<sup>18</sup> The first informs us that in 1511 Philippe de Charrins, Abbess of Saint-Jean at Autun, requested and received eight nuns from Marcigny for the purpose of reforming and restoring regular discipline in her Abbey. A similar case occurred some forty years later, in 1554, when Claude du Ble de Cormatin, a professed nun of the priory of Lanchard de Chalon, was received at Marcigny by order of the Cardinal of Lorraine. Here she was to be instructed in religious discipline and the Divine Services so that on her return to the priory of Lanchard her example might serve as an inspiration to and a model for the other nuns there.

### Disappearance of the Convents

What the fate of the convents in Italy and Spain was we do not know. We are also in ignorance of the later destinies of some of the smaller French houses; but the larger houses, such as Marcigny and Lavenne, as well as the smaller foundations still in existence at the time of the French Revolution found their long career of service to God and man brought to an end by the violent, vindictive anti-clericalism which desolated France during those years. The English convents came to an even more premature end in the hands of the schismatic and self-willed King of England, Henry VIII. Certainly what was said of the nuns of the convent of Arthington by one of the commissioners for its dissolution is equally applicable to the nuns of the other convents: "All these persons be of good religious liffying and not slandered." The record of their achievements, humble though they were, is that of glorious triumph.

<sup>18</sup> Cucherat, op. cit., 243 and 246.

## Books Received

*Mitri: The Story of Prince Demetrius Gallitzin*, by Daniel Sargent. New York. Longmans Green. 1945. pp. 327. \$3.50

*From Democracy to Nazism*, by Rudolf Heberle. Baton Rouge. Louisiana State University. 1945. pp. vii + 130. \$2.50

*A Price for Peace*, by Antonin Basch. New York. Columbia. 1945. \$2.50

*Principio to Wheeling*, by Earl Chapin May. New York. Harper. 1945. pp. xiv + 335. \$3.00

*The Hope for Immortality*, by Ralph Barton Perry. New York. Vanguard Press. 1945. pp. 28. \$1.00

*Maryknoll Mission Letters*. Vol. I, 1945. New York. Field Afar. pp. viii + 55. \$0.50

<sup>15</sup> *Sancti Benedicti Regula Monasteriorum*.

<sup>16</sup> *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, 1705 et seq.

<sup>17</sup> Peter the Venerable, *Epistolae*, Book VI, No. 39, in Migne 189, 890.



## Gallitzin's Biography

(Continued from page eight)

litzin's first and all-important weeks on our side of the Atlantic. We know only two major facts: that the young prince was never eager for Reverend Brosius' company, and that he availed himself of the possibility to take lodging at the seminary opened shortly before by the Fathers of Saint-Sulpice, who for a century and more had been training French parish priests. Father Nagot of that society had come to Baltimore to found a seminary for the training of American priests.

Now, I cannot imagine that Bishop Carroll would have advised the young prince to live in this seminary if he had taken him for a man of the world intending to study the political conditions of the United States, and then, after two years, to return to Europe in order to become an army officer or a career diplomat. The bishop's advice leads to the impression that the young prince already was convinced of his clerical vocation and had communicated this resolution on the occasion of his first visit with the then only Catholic bishop residing in the States. Moreover, Bishop Carroll did what he would never have done in the case of a young man of the world on his *grand tour*: he took him on trips into the country to the forlorn little chapels of Maryland in order to impress upon the pampered young prince of one of Europe's great families how primitive Catholic life in America was. Scarcely a week had passed after the young man had entered the Seminary of St. Sulpice as a guest, when Bishop Carroll wrote a letter to President Nagot, recommending to him that he accept his visitor as a student. "I am sending this to you now, as he desires to remain here and enter the ecclesiastical state. His decision is to stay in your seminary to prepare himself for the ministry."<sup>10</sup>

All authorities on Gallitzin, with the exception of Dr. Plumpe, seem to think that his decision to become a priest was a sudden one, taken either while Augustine was on the high seas or during the very beginning of his stay at Baltimore. But are we to suppose that a bishop with such a delicate feeling of personal responsibility as John Carroll,<sup>11</sup> should have encouraged a young man on his *grand tour* to study theology with the Sulpician Fathers if the young man's belief in his vocation was of so recent origin? Since Bishop Carroll thought that young Gallitzin was "fit to be Levite of the Church,"<sup>12</sup> he must have been convinced that his inclination to become a priest was of long standing. This would fit in well with the impression of the Stolbergs as to the design of the prince's American voyage. The Stolbergs erred only in the assumption that Princess Amalia was the confidante of her son's plans. On the contrary, there was some stubbornness in the prince against confiding in his somewhat imperious mother. He was not, after all, as vacuous and irresolute as his mother thought.

<sup>10</sup> Letter found by Sargent in the Archives of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, and printed op. cit., 77f.

<sup>11</sup> This is a sympathetic impression that Peter Guilday's standard biography, *The Life and Times of John Carroll* (New York, 1922), will give to any serious reader.

<sup>12</sup> Sargent, op. cit., 77.

This lack of confidence in his mother also explains why he did not inform her first of his entrance upon theological studies, but his former confessor, the Franciscan Schnoesenberg. He did so *sub sigillo confessionis*, with the express remark that one should confide one's "innermost thoughts" rather to one's confessor than to one's parents.<sup>13</sup> He had never liked the high-flown verbosity of his mother and her circle of intellectuals. His was a harsher nature, and he would rather play dumb than exhibit his sentiments. This was the impulse that drove him from old Europe to America and here again from a recently established civilization into the pure air of the backwoods. Abhorring the thin atmosphere of his mother's salon with its philosophizings and discussions, he chose the vigorous, stout-hearted Catholic life among American pioneers as the proper province of the priestly vocation of the son of Muenster's "intellectual queen."<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Lemcke, op. cit., 66.

<sup>14</sup> Sargent, op. cit., 62. How the mother annoyed Nagot, the President of the Sulpician Seminary, by her useless interference in Augustine's spiritual education may be seen from a long letter by her confessor, Father Overberg, (see especially Lemcke, op. cit., 88), which shows also Princess Amalia's resentment that her son made the most important decision of his life without her advice. More than a year after Augustine had entered the seminary with the clear intention of becoming an American missionary his mother asked him not to precipitate himself and not to bind himself by vow to America and the American missions (Lemcke, 73). The first indication of Princess Amalia's concurrence in her son's decision is to be found in her letter of March 20, 1794 (Lemcke, 74).

## Russia—Fr. Brusher

(Continued from page twelve)

is that what is going on in Europe now is merely an imperfection; that to be disgusted and aquiver with moral indignation at the oppression of Eastern Europe is to be guilty of "perfectionist nihilism". Surely the shape of things to come in Eastern Europe is assuming so unjust and vicious an aspect that to pooh pooh it as a minor manifestation of the results of original sin is to play the ostrich who chooses to bury its head in the sand rather than to see oncoming evil.

Perfectionist nihilism to be indignant about the enslavement of Eastern Europe! Look at the record.

Poland delivered over to her old enemy and brutal oppression, Poland, who fought the Nazis even when Soviet Russia in collaboration with Hitler was knifing her in the back.

The Baltic States, true workers' republics, beacon lights of social justice in a dark East, extinguished by the brutal feet of Soviet Russians. Rumania; those who have read the article in *The Saturday Evening Post* for June 23, 1945, can realize something of what is going on there. Bulgaria, where reports indicate that the elimination of democrats is going merrily on. Yugoslavia, dominated by a red Quisling, is undergoing a reign of terror. God alone knows what is going on in Hungary, but I tremble for the brave people who threw off the bloody yoke of Bela Kun Tibor Samuelli. Stalin does not forget.

There is no point in going on. Anyone who has followed the meagre reports from Soviet-occupied Eastern



Europe must realize that to deplore the situation there is scarcely to be guilty of perfectionist nihilism. So far from that, I venture to say that the coming peace will be the most unjust general settlement that Europe has ever seen—and that includes the Vienna treaties.

A few words on other inaccuracies or misconceptions found in Father Dunne's article before going on to Soviet Russia's record. Notice has already been taken of Father Dunne's assumption that the Russian system is academic socialism. What can we say of his statement that the United States entered the war "only when bombs dropped from the skies on Pearl Harbor." The United States declared war only after Pearl Harbor? Yes. The United States entered the war only after Pearl Harbor? No. The United States, realizing the danger of a Hitler victory, plunged into the war by lend-lease, by occupying Iceland, by convoying merchantmen and by firing upon German submarines.

Father Dunne has thoroughly digested the Soviet propaganda line that Russian attacks on small nations is aggression for security; that Russia needs to gorge herself on her neighbors for safety's sake. Let's look at what happened to the Baltic States.

In 1939 Russia high-handedly demanded bases in the Baltic Republics. In return she promised to respect the social and political institutions of those countries. Yet within a year Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania had been incorporated bodily into the Soviet Union! Was the security of the U.S.S.R. threatened in this case?

Now what about Russia and world peace? After all, the maintenance of a stable peace depends to a certain extent on the trust nations can have in each other's word. And right here is our big difficulty with Russia. Her word is worthless.

First of all, the rulers of the U.S.S.R. are avowed if not orthodox Communists. Now, Communism holds that "... morality is subordinated to the interests of the proletarian class struggle ..."<sup>1</sup>

But perhaps the Russians are not as bad as their theory; perhaps Stalin does not follow his master in this. Let the record speak.

The Soviet Union had an excellent record when there was question of making treaties. Russia led the way in rallying Eastern Europe to the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and in the Litvinov Pact bound herself together with Poland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania and Rumania to adhere to the anti-war agreement. Russia by 1939 had non-aggression pacts with Lithuania, Poland, Finland, Rumania, Turkey, Estonia, Latvia, and Afghanistan.

All this was very reassuring, but would the Soviet Union keep these treaties? We know it did not; that on the contrary, it was almost as much a portent of coming aggression to have a non-aggression pact with Communist Russia as it was to have one with Nazi Germany.<sup>2</sup>

Thus we can see that Stalin practices what Lenin

preaches—that morality is subordinated to the interests of the proletarian world struggle.

No one wants war; but it is one thing to seek war, quite another to be on the alert. Certainly Americans would be foolish to deal with Soviet Russia on the *as if* theory—as if she were not what she is. The dangers to world peace inherent in Soviet Russia's theory and record are not created by those who point them out.

Father Dunne ends with a flow of rhetoric which leaves one gasping.

"The prophets of doom can keep beating their drums; they can keep viewing with alarm the rise of Soviet power, pointing with fear to the Leftist movement in France, in Italy, to the Communist influence in labor unions, in the PAC, etc., until the Communist revolution sweeps over them. Or they can abandon their drums and come out into the arena of the world and unite their efforts with men of good-will everywhere to build a better world."

Well! I do not know why it is necessary to stop pointing out the evils of Communism in order to start building a new world. Surely Father Dunne cannot mean this. Communism threatens not only to prevent a better world from coming into being, but even menaces the happiness of the present world, such as it is. We would be recreant to our duty were we to stop beating the alarm drums.

Of course, one aspect of the above statement does make sense. Let us "accentuate the positive"; let us work to bring about a better social order and thus undermine the specious appeal of Communism. This does make good sense. But what are we to make of the rest?

"If that better world is to be built it will be built not by dividing the world into two warring camps; the Communists (sic) and the anti-Communist. This has been tried and the common people of the world have had enough of it. It gave them Fascism and Naziism and it is threatening to give them more of the same in China."

May I ask Father Dunne how we are going to prevent this division, if Communism stands for dictatorship and we for democracy, if Communism stands for atheistic materialism and we for Christianity, if Communism stands for world revolution and we have a reasonable desire to maintain our way of life? Surely he would not have us turn Communist. Would he have us ignore the evils of Communism? Would he have us, (and by us, I mean all believers in God and the spiritual, all believers in freedom and the rights of man) be supine before the attacks of Communism?

No matter how close or how loose the connection between the Kremlin and world revolution, Father Dunne cannot deny that *Communism* is on the offensive, and we will never defend ourselves by pretending that this bloody-jowled wild-cat is a house-broken pussy.

Note too the subtle implications that to be anti-Communist is to be fascist. This is not logical, but it is the propaganda peddled by Moscow. Communists like nothing better than to see this false idea spread wholesale.

There are many other points I would like to take up, but I feel that this has gone on long enough. Throughout Father Dunne's article there are two things noticeable. The first is a lack of proportion in the comparison between Russian aggression and oppression with the

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, (Speech delivered at the Third All-Russian Congress of the Young Communist League of the Soviet Union, October 2, 1920) *Religion*, Little Lenin Library, Vol. 7, International Publishers, New York, 1933, p. 48.

<sup>2</sup> On Russia's treaty making see Joseph S. Brusher, S.J., "The Bear At the Conference Table," *The Catholic World*, Vol. CLVIII, No. 947, February 1944, p. 965.



condition of the Oakies and Negroes in this country. These people can and do agitate to improve their condition. Just imagine a Lithuanian agitating to improve his condition!

The second feature noticeable is a coldness towards the suffering peoples of Eastern Europe which is reminiscent of the *Nation*, *New Republic* type of pseudo-liberalism. This pseudo-liberalism waxes indignant over oppression—but only in certain pet causes. We should like to see a universal moral indignation which condemns oppression of Jew and Gentile, White and Black, Slav peasants and Southern sharecroppers—an indignation which kindles at *all* injustice.

## Russia—Fr. Dunne

(Continued from page twelve)

difference to the sufferings of the people in Eastern Europe, any more than the Concordat with Nazi Germany implied indifference to the injustices inherent in the Nazi system. It would simply mean that the Holy See believed that there was more hope of avoiding greater evil, both for the people of Eastern Europe and for the world, in attempting to establish friendly relations with the Soviet regime than in pouring more oil on the fires of Soviet hostility. Meanwhile, the Holy See keeps the door open to an understanding. It answers unfair attacks with dignity and, when occasion requires, sharply. It has made perfectly clear the Church's position on the errors of Communism. But despite all provocations, it has steadfastly refused to engage in that type of anti-Russian campaign, compounded largely of an un-Christian hatred and fear, which has characterized too many of the anti-Communist activities of certain Catholic speakers and publicists in this country and which, I suspect, has not made the task of the Holy See any easier. If the door to an understanding is slammed, it will not be slammed by the Holy See, but by the Soviet regime possibly encouraged to do so by the type of campaign to which I object and which is well calculated to persuade the leaders of Soviet Russia that it is fruitless to think of improving relations with the Catholic Church.

I am glad that Father Brusher is aware of the differences between academic Socialism and the Socialism of the U.S.S.R. Not everybody is. Only the other day I heard one of those who is not thus alert deny the production figures for the U.S.S.R. because his ethics manual had taught him that production not powered by the profit motive was an impossibility.

Father Brusher thinks that we entered the war before Pearl Harbor. I think when our courts of law get around to hearing the numerous cases involving the legal question of when the United States entered the war he will learn that the courts do not agree with him. There is a vast difference between our pre-Pearl Harbor support of Great Britain and Russia and our post-Pearl Harbor military intervention. In any case there is no pertinence to Father Brusher's quibble inasmuch as even in arguing his theory that we "plunged into the war" prior to Pearl Harbor he explicitly admits the point I was making in this part of my article. When he says that "real-

izing the danger of a Hitler victory" we entered the war even prior to Pearl Harbor he is saying exactly what I said, viz., that we entered the war out of a motive of self-defense.

Father Brusher implies that my attitude is one of naive trust and that I believe we should not be "on the alert." Again I can only suggest that he read my article. I explicitly recognized the "dangerous possibilities which the greatly increased power of the U.S.S.R. hold for the world" and warned against being "naively blind" to them. I insisted that the facts impose "the necessity of weighing well those possibilities."

Father Brusher wants to know what I think we should do to prevent the division of the world into two warring camps: the Communist and the anti-Communist. It was not necessary for him to reassure himself that I surely would not suggest that we turn Communist. My article made clear what I stand for, viz., that while remaining fully alert to the dangerous possibilities inherent in Soviet power we do "everything possible to off-set them by bringing Soviet Russia into a framework of mutual cooperation which offers the hope of diminishing in time the distance that separates Russia from the rest of the world." Father Brusher evidently believes that that distance is fixed and irrevocable, that Soviet Russia is confirmed in dictatorship and atheistic materialism. It is my belief that it is not, inasmuch as I believe in Divine Providence and in the dynamic power of charity, but it is my firm conviction that the attitude represented by Father Brusher is doing everything possible to destroy the hope and to make the separation final.

Father Brusher is reading his own prejudices into my article when he claims to note "subtle implications that to be anti-Communist is to be fascist." The Holy Father, Mr. Bevin, Mr. Truman and a great many other people, including millions of ordinary people, are anti-Communist without being fascist. But there is a *certain type* of anti-Communist propaganda which is fascist, either consciously or in the sense that it makes its appeal to the fascist type of mind which is a mind dominated by hatred and fear.

In this connection the reactions to my article supplied me with interesting evidence of the kind of mind that this type of propaganda appeals to. I received a large number of letters commenting upon my article. All but six of these letters were favorable and none of these latter were from Communists or Communist sympathizers. They were from intelligent people, lay and clerical, soberly concerned with the future peace of the world. The six unfavorable letters, with one exception, had this in common that they literally spat hatred and breathed violence. They were filled with vituperation, bombast, and ugly epithets. Two of them could involve their authors in trouble with the postal authorities were I to put their missives in the proper hands. All of them had been avowedly nourished on the kind of anti-Communist propaganda to which I object. One of them enclosed with his hate-filled letter a number of pamphlets with which I was already too familiar.

The one exception was really no exception because,



while his letter was restrained, the author sent on two pamphlets written by himself which betrayed the same characteristics. The author, who regards himself as a staunch, militant Catholic, in his first pamphlet, published at the request of and carrying the special endorsement of the Sodality Union, Washington, D. C., varies its attacks upon Socialism and Communism with far from subtle attacks upon the Jews. In his second pamphlet, not carrying the endorsement of his previous sponsor be it said, the true colors of this "militant Catholic" are revealed. He is a fierce chauvinist, a fierce *laissez-faire* capitalist, who to his attacks upon Marxism and the Jews now adds a bitter attack upon Leo XIII, Pius XI, the American hierarchy, and Pius XII.

A campaign which enlists support by appealing to the instincts of hatred and fear will find itself with some queer camp-followers, bearing a striking resemblance to the *exaltés* who filled the *cadres* of the Nazi, the

Fascist, and the Falangist parties. It is *this kind* of anti-Communist drum beating to which I object in the passage whose "flow of rhetoric" left Father Brusher gasping.

Just one word about Father Brusher's concluding paragraph which I treat with more restraint than it deserves. I have already pointed out the difference between moral indignation and the necessity of making a tragic choice of the lesser of two evils in the formulation of political policy. I think I have also suggested that there is a difference between moral indignation and the preaching of hatred for one's enemies, at least there is for the Christian. These things being understood, allow me to say with humility that the sadness which I feel at oppression draws no lines, geographical, racial, political, or credal. It is precisely to such selectivity of moral indignation that I object—and a lot of people besides the pseudo-liberals are guilty of such selectivity. And their name is legion.

## Recent Books in Review

### European History

**The French Revolution**, by J. M. Thompson. Oxford University Press, New York. 1945. pp. xvi + 591. \$5.00

In this book Mr. Thompson offers to the reader the fruit of a life-long study of the French Revolution. The author, who has tutored Oxford students in modern French history for many years, is undoubtedly the outstanding English authority on the French Revolution; and his book reveals an intimate knowledge of both the important happenings of the Revolution and the little human details all too often overlooked in critical movements of history.

Hundreds of general accounts of the French Revolution have already been written, many of them in English. But Mr. Thompson's new book is distinguished from its fellows chiefly for the descriptions of men and places, nowhere else so well given, and for its readability. The author manages, in describing characters, to tag them fairly accurately with phrases not easily forgotten. Lafayette, for example, is the "Peter Pan of Revolution" with "an air of self-conscious rectitude." Mirabeau "could not see a pretty woman without falling in love with her, nor encounter a subject of controversy without writing about it." And Bailly, "at the dangerous age of fifty-two, when any man may make a fool of himself in politics or matrimony, had done both."

This book is not thoroughly objective (only an angel can write an objective account of the French Revolution), although the author tries to be fair and does not make the mistake of painting anyone or any event in plain black and white. He clearly follows in the tradition of the Aulard-Mathiez school, and certainly he is unfair to the Taine-Madelin group in his "list of fifty best books on the Revolution." Not to mention Taine or Madelin or Gaxotte or Cochin, when Carlyle's *French Revolution* and Gower's *Despatches from Paris* are included, does not argue for complete objectivity.

Unfortunately for himself, this reviewer believes, Mr. Thompson has written a book that cannot handily be used as a text on the French Revolution. He begins his account with the election of the Estates General in 1789 and concludes it with the Thermidorean reaction of 1794. Nothing is said, directly at least, of conditions that brought on the revolution, and nothing is said of the Directory, the Consulate or the Empire. American students will encounter one other difficulty. Mr. Thompson, evidently as the result of many years' tutoring at Oxford in this subject, thought it helpful to fill his book with allusions to English places and Englishmen. But it does not help the American much to inform him that *Les Invalides* was the equivalent of Chelsea Hospital, or the *Bastille* about like Conway or Corfe.

The book is to be highly recommended, however, for covering the period from 1789 to 1794 more thoroughly than any comparable text in English. Because of its good descriptive sections and intelligent use of apt details, it serves to bring the

French Revolution to life for the reader without sacrificing scholarly accuracy. It should serve admirably as collateral reading for students taking a course in French Revolution and using one of the generally accepted American texts. With Madelin's *French Revolution*, it ranks as the most readable scholarly account of the subject, and the interested student could do no better than to read both Thompson and Madelin in order to form a full and a fairly objective picture of the French Revolution.

THOMAS P. NEILL

**The Ukraine: A Submerged Nation**, by William Henry Chamberlin. The Macmillan Company, New York. 1945. pp. 91. \$1.75

William Henry Chamberlin remains one of the better informed and more objective reporters on things Russian in a day when everyone who has spent a week in the country is writing about it. This little work on the Ukraine is written to plead for some kind of autonomy for "the most numerous people in Europe without a sovereign state form of organization." The author pleads his case by showing that there is a Ukrainian nation, language, culture, and historical tradition. He then shows briefly why there is still no Ukrainian state, and concludes that "a free Ukraine . . . is an indispensable element in a free Europe and in a free world."

Chamberlin does not write an exhaustive enough work here to offer the reader information not already obtainable in English. But he does present reliably the most salient facts of Ukrainian history, geography and sociology. A series of such little books as this on the various peoples of Europe would do much to introduce the average American reader to a Europe we must come to know.

The teacher of history will perhaps find the two chapters on "The Heroic Age" and "The Ukraine in the Shadows" the most useful. The first chapter is purely descriptive, and the others deal with the Ukraine between the two wars—a subject which Chamberlin himself has treated more extensively elsewhere. The chief value of this little book, it seems, is to present briefly those historical facts which explain why forty million Ukrainians who have been conscious of their nationality have not been able to form a national state.

THOMAS P. NEILL

### American History

**The Young Jefferson**, by Claude G. Bowers. Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston. 1945. pp. 544 + xxx. \$3.75

Jefferson has always been an intriguing figure to the American historian. Every student has found peculiar interests of his own reflected from some facet or other of this many-sided character. So vast indeed were the interests of Jefferson that only the broadly informed and deeply educated can begin to comprehend and critically evaluate his life, his philosophy, and his



contributions to the American way. Biographers of Jefferson have to be more than ordinarily equipped to handle properly their subject.

Besides, the task of writing a life of Jefferson is further entangled by the almost unlimited supply of source materials. Few major libraries in the country are lacking a Jefferson collection. This abundance, together with pertinent writings of his contemporaries, diminishes the hopes of a definitive biography. The new Princeton-New York Times publication of Jefferson's works, however, may shed advantageous light on the question.

*The Young Jefferson* is the third and concluding volume of a biography by Claude G. Bowers. His *Jefferson and Hamilton* and his *Jefferson in Power* are already known to the historian. This third volume preserves the same tenor and flavor of the other two. There is no doubt concerning the opinion of the author: Jefferson is definitely the idol and hero who can do no wrong. So vigorous a defense is waged that the average reader is sometimes left cold and skeptical. Thus the revolutionary gubernatorial position of Jefferson is painted as national on one side and yet provincial on the other—a contrast too severe to be convincing. Jefferson was certainly a great man, but such over-emphasis as Bowers inclines to, frequently has the opposite effect of admiration.

The book, as most of those by the author, is written in vivid blacks and whites. There is the hero, and everyone who opposes him becomes a villain. Furthermore, matters are simplified beyond measure. Thus, for example, the whole question of religious freedom, which is receiving great discussion today—as in the series of articles in *Theological Studies*—is treated as a simple issue settled ever since Jefferson wrote his Ordinance of Religious Freedom. That this solution might not be completely adequate is not even hinted, nor is it suggested that the preamble to the Ordinance might be at variance with sound theological discussion of the act of faith.

Again, Bowers has a very dramatic style. This makes for very interesting reading and, coupled with his simplification of events, it has popularized his books with the public. While history need never be dull reading, it does not have to be overdramatized to be interesting. Finally, the frequent recurrence of pet words and phrases—such as “bromidic”—fails to add the spice expected of them.

This volume does not equal the author's *Jefferson and Hamilton*. There is not the same attention to background, for instance, nor is there the same opportunity for contrast around which Bowers paints so much of his narrative. The historian will find nothing new in this volume, but it is an interesting account for those who like their history simplified and dramatized.

JOSEPH R. FRESE

**Portrait of New Netherlands**, by Ellis L. Raesly. Columbia University Press. New York. 1945. pp. viii + 370. \$4.00

This book has deservedly received favorable reviews. The author attempts, successfully, to present a picture of life in colonial New Netherlands in such fashion as to give us a good understanding of the times. One savors the era from reading the book. It should not be forgotten by readers that much careful work went into the making of this book. It is a simple matter to conjure a picture of any era and then seek out such neat references as will give authority for a preconceived concept. Such a plan was not followed by the author of this book as is evidenced by his careful product. To present figures on prices and give some trustworthy indications of shipping is a hard task for the research student, as anyone who has tried such a matter will attest. New Netherlands from our point of view was a colorful era. But for the author to keep his head and avoid overdrawing his portrait required clear application to the task.

In connection with the subject of this book, it should be recorded by someone that New Netherlands still lacks a really monumental historian. Since O'Callaghan's time we have had no satisfactory study. During those many years innumerable phases of the period have been given careful attention. But for a really authoritative study of the period we still await a scholar with the patience to organize all that has been done and present us with a satisfactory, reliable history of New Netherlands. It is to be hoped that Mr. Raesly will assume the task.

JOSEPH P. DONNELLY

**A Padre Views South America**, by Peter M. Dunne, S.J., Ph.D. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1945. pp. xi + 290. \$2.50

When Father Peter Dunne, Chairman of the History Department of the University of San Francisco, went rolling down to

Rio on a well-earned sabbatical year leave of absence, it was a foregone conclusion that he would write an interesting volume concerning his experiences in Latin America. Here is that volume—and it merits praise because of the mature prose in which the narrative is cast, because of the intrinsic interest of the subject viewed by an American Padre who has taught and written about South America for some years, and because, too, of the calm, objective, detached picture it furnishes of our South American brethren.

Fr. Dunne is of the Bolton school of Berkeley; he has already authored two scholarly volumes on the history of the Jesuit Missions of Mexico. This reviewer can testify to the fact that both Fr. Dunne and his books are held in high esteem in the Berkeley campus; this volume, while cast in a somewhat lighter vein, will enhance that reputation still more. For, although there will be disagreement with some of the author's conclusions, all fair-minded persons will see in Fr. Dunne's work a sincere effort to practice some of that “inexorable impartiality” which he has been praising as a pedagogue for many years. The volume reads easily, and those who have never known Fr. Dunne will feel upon the completion of their perusal that they have acquired a friend.

While thoroughly agreeing with the author's plea for a properly understood tolerance—“after all, religion should be a source of charity and peace, not of misunderstanding and strife,” (p. 95)—this reviewer is inclined to question the observation that “some Anglo-Catholics are doctrinally ninety-nine and one-half per cent Catholic.” The words can be understood, in context, in a justly benevolent sense; taken out of context, as they most assuredly will be, they might have the effect of appearing as a belittling of the importance of the authority of the Roman Pontiff since, presumably, the “half per cent” of doctrinal difference allowed by Fr. Dunne concerns itself with the denial of papal claims by the Anglo-Catholics. Still, though, with the concluding words of this paragraph there should be no disagreement: “Religion should be a unifying, not a dividing force.”

Two technical inaccuracies slightly mar the book: the “Contents” promise a “List of pictures” on page xiv: there is no such list. Page 57 has a misprint: “comunity” for “community.” On page 92, a Dr. Normant is listed as president of Asuncion's Colegio Internacional, while on page 96, a Dr. Lemmon is so listed.

This reviewer feels that this little volume is destined to do much good in interpreting Latin America to sincere and well-meaning scholars who, because of different religious background or a total lack of much preparation, find the Catholicism of the South Americans a “mystery wrapped up in a riddle.” Fr. Dunne's tolerant, mature, wise exposition of this problem alone suffices to make his volume a valuable contribution to the vital cause of hemispheric good-will.

JOHN B. MCGLOIN

**The Fall of the Old Colonial System, A Study in British Free Trade 1770-1870**, by Robert Livingston Schuyler. Oxford University Press, New York. 1945. pp. vii + 344. \$3.00

Everyone agrees that the problems of empire building have never been simple. Professor Schuyler shows how involved and difficult this problem was for Great Britain during the period 1770 to 1870. Added to the many perplexing questions concerning the relationship of the colonies to the mother country was the disturbing fact that a growing number of Englishmen were of the opinion that the retention of colonies was an intolerable burden, a burden which should not be shouldered. Under the leadership of Adam Smith and his followers, the attacks on the principles of the mercantilist system increased. Under the pressure of this opposition, British statesmanship outgrew the mentality of the Old Colonial System. The fact that the change was a gradual one and that the liberals did not overwhelm the more conservative elements all at once, made the emergence of the British Commonwealth of Nations possible.

Basing his studies on the Parliamentary Papers and private letters of statesmen, Professor Schuyler shows how the old concept of colonies gradually gave way in the face of constant attack on the part of the free traders. These latter gathered force for their arguments from the spirit of pessimism and defeatism with regard to colonies which was engendered by the loss of the Thirteen Colonies. However, the conservatives did not give ground immediately. It was not until 1822 that the arguments of the free traders began to have an effect in breaking down the old commercial system. From that date until the rise of a new imperialistic spirit after 1870, step after step was taken along liberal lines which threatened the dissolution of the British Empire.

Contemporaries who are interested in the burning question of colonies will find it worth while to follow the program of those Englishmen who were working for the dismemberment of



the Empire as well as those who were convinced that the dissolution was inevitable. It was during the period under consideration, as the author points out, that "separatism was distinctly a British, not a colonial, phenomenon."

Professor Schuyler's handling of his subject is interesting. He traces the growth of the free trade movement and shows how it was intimately linked with the growth of anti-imperialistic agitation from the time of Adam Smith to that of Goldwin Smith. Pamphlets and reports on parliamentary debates advocating the dismemberment of the Empire are presented showing the chronological development of the liberal movement. The anti-imperialists hoped for, and deliberately worked for the dissolution of the Empire. Such a policy involved taking definite steps towards untying the bonds which held the colonies bound to the mother country. The liberals were interested primarily in destroying the commercial bonds and withdrawing the garrisons which were kept in the colonies for the purpose of protecting the interests of England.

It is worthy of note that while the statesmen were working for the dissolution of the empire public opinion was seemingly apathetic. It was not until 1868 that opposition to the anti-imperialistic policies of the government began to come to the fore. Disraeli sensed the change and made an issue of imperialism. Changing conditions and the rapid developments in the field of communications brought about this reaction and put imperialism in the ascendancy once again. Nevertheless, the work of half a century had not been in vain. Before retiring from the field the anti-imperialists did much to make the British Commonwealth of Nations possible.

Professor Schuyler's study is measured and steady, without the occasional flash which saves such a work from becoming a little dull. It would be a difficult task to contest any of the facts which are presented. The notes are placed at the end of the text, followed by a rather complete bibliography. Without a doubt, this work is timely since the questions of trade and colonies are most assuredly coming into the limelight after our recent tragic experience.

H. L. STANSELL

## Social Science

*Weapons for Peace*, by Thomas P. Neill. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee. 1945. pp. ix + 234. \$2.50

The nation's book counters are glutted with books on peace. This in itself is a healthy sign for it shows that minds and pens are being used to attack this pressing problem, to call its importance to the attention of our people, to point out possible paths to peace. Unfortunately, the vast majority of these efforts to solve the problem are ephemeral and valueless. Either they fail to understand what peace really is, or they build their hopes and plans for universal peace on foundations of sand, on principles vitiated by error and misunderstanding of the nature of man and the purpose of society. They fail to see that the difficulties in the way of peace today are the effects of a deliberate and progressive perversion of the natural order planned by God, a perversion of the concepts of the state, of economic society, of man himself. Since peace is that natural and normal tranquillity of order which should prevail among men, it is absolutely necessary to know *what* man is and *why* he is. Peace plans which neglect these essential facts must be impractical and impotent for they bear in themselves the seeds of inevitable frustration and failure. At best they can propose no more than a truce, a period of suspicious watching and waiting between armed outbreaks.

Happily, some few thinkers and writers have probed to the root of the problem and have come up with sound, positive contributions to the cause of peace. Dr. Neill is very definitely one of these. His *Weapons for Peace* is a clear, well-reasoned statement of those fundamental and eternally true principles on which peace and all human relations must be based. No one who is sincerely interested in peace—and that should mean all of us—can afford to ignore Dr. Neill's arguments. They are basic to an understanding of the question and to the formulation of an answer. It will indeed be a misfortune if his book is shrugged off as "just another book on peace." It will be an equal misfortune if the book is passed over because of the criticism of certain reviewers that the author fails to give any concrete proposals for effecting peace immediately. This is not a valid criticism for his purpose is not to propose a ready-made blueprint but to call attention to the correct basic principles on which the actual machinery for the implementation of peace must be built if it is to succeed. The construction of such machinery of peace must be "the concern of experts, whose task it will be to give concrete expression to the general peace principles."

*Weapons for Peace* clearly analyzes this situation, tracing the deception of men which began over five hundred years ago with

that unnatural offspring of the Renaissance—the amoral individualist divorced from social consciousness. Here man, the creature, usurped the Creator's place as the center of things. The breach made at this time in the divine plan was widened by Luther and the other "Reformers" of the 16th century who applied individualism to religious and spiritual matters while crushing the individual into total submission to the Absolutist State. Men were told they had no free will, were not responsible, could perform no good acts. All was pre-arranged by God; worldly success was the mark of divine pre-election. This canonization of worldly success led to the vicious heresy of Pragmatism. Logically and inevitably followed the generation of other unnatural progeny—scepticism, materialism, liberalism, "deified" science, communism, nazism, all contributing to the progressive degradation of human nature and to the rejection and denial of the principles of natural law and of God Himself.

Clearly, then, the way out is the return to those truths and principles on which alone man's dignity and worth can be maintained and on which alone that tranquillity of order which is peace can be based.

PHILIP T. DERRIG

*China among the Powers*, by David Nelson Rowe. Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York. 1945. pp. x + 205. \$2.00

To those who are blindly loyal to a gallant China, this book will not be very acceptable; to those who are undermining American sympathy for China, it will prove a welcome tool to create misunderstanding about our ally. Such a reception is not the fault of the book itself which is a scholarly and impartial study of the facts but it is attributable rather to the unfortunate struggle between American and non-American interests, which have tried to discredit China, and the Chinese and their friends who have overstated their case in counter propaganda.

*China among the Powers* poses the question, "Can China emerge from this war as a nation and a power capable of protecting herself and of maintaining peace and security in the Far East?" This frame of reference must constantly be kept in mind as one follows Mr. Rowe's searching analysis of China's strength and weakness; otherwise, his surveys of China's present position and future possibilities may seem unfair to a country which has withstood more than eight years of war when it was still weak from rebirth to nationhood.

Mr. Rowe first takes up China's world position today and considers in his first chapter America's interest in China as a stabilizing influence in the Far East. The next chapter is an impartial if not very flattering estimate of the present day military power of China. In fact, Mr. Rowe seems to have painted a slightly too pessimistic picture, for the United States Army Command in China has just announced that it has twenty Chinese divisions fully trained and nineteen other divisions from fifty to seventy-five per cent trained according to American standards.

In Part Two, Mr. Rowe makes a comprehensive survey of China's resources for military power in which he devotes chapters to manpower, agriculture, and industrial raw materials respectively. In the chapter on manpower, the author concludes that in spite of all considerations, China's population is a burden and will become more of a burden in the future. His solution is the simplest, namely, birth control. Other possible solutions, he dismisses as unfeasible; and he has overlooked, or at least passed over, the effects on the birth rate of urbanization, industrialization, longer years of education, and later marriages which operate independently of the use of contraceptives. The chapters on agriculture and industrial raw materials are as good general surveys on these subjects as it is possible to prepare from the sources available during war times. They should be read by all Americans who are interested in China and who are as yet unacquainted with conditions there.

Part Three deals with the integration of China's power by presenting in three chapters the problems of industrial development, of transport and communications, and of government and social organization. These chapters cannot be overlooked by those who are planning China's future, and they are invaluable to Americans who wish to understand the staggering problems which China now faces. In view of the fact that China has wrestled victoriously with these same problems during more than eight years of war, we should be optimistic rather than pessimistic about her ability to overcome them in the years of peace. A final chapter in Part Four, *China in the World of Tomorrow*, sketches a proposal for organization for peace in the Far East. Mr. Rowe's suggestions, which are impartial and well considered, seem to be on their way to realization if we may judge from the initial steps that have been taken in the Far East since Japan's unconditional surrender. This book is worth careful study by all who wish to have a realistic and comprehensive picture of China's present conditions and future problems.

ALBERT R. O'HARA



**Father Theobald Mathew**, Apostle of Temperance, by Rev. Patrick Rogers. Longmans, Green and Co., New York. 1945. pp. 166. \$2.50

Seven million people, it is said, took the total abstinence pledge from Father Theobald Mathew. Nevertheless he is almost unknown in America today. He had no head for money or organization; if he had possessed such talent perhaps his great temperance society would still be known and in operation today. But he did not save money; he did not plan for the future; his heart was aware only of the present distress of individuals, families, and the enslavement of a great part of the Irish nation to poverty and drunkenness in the early nineteenth century. This great apostle refused his help to no one, but he built no framework upon which others could build who followed him. His personal spirit was the backbone of this vigorous movement. When he died further work of this type almost ceased.

It was not until 1838, when Father Mathew was forty-eight years of age, that he agreed to take charge of the Cork Total Abstinence Society. He believed that if the cause of his country's degradation were removed then the effects would come to an end. It may seem a wonder that confirmed drunkards should take the pledge, still throngs crowded to hear this Capuchin priest and to repeat the words of the pledge after him. It is an established fact that a veritable moral reformation followed him into the cities and towns of Ireland. Men who before made their families miserable and heart-broken now cared for their businesses and farms.

This book is hardly more than a bare outline of the tremendous activity of Father Mathew. His life was packed full of action; it should not be forgotten. The author aims chiefly at revealing not so much the personal depths of the subject's life but rather the work of the temperance movement as he influenced it. The fact that character and color are lifeless may be traced to the author's scanty use of dialogue and description; nevertheless the reader can perceive beneath the plentiful facts and quotations from contemporaneous biographers the energetic spirit of a man who was Provincial of the Capuchin Order, organized schools, and faced the problems of drunkenness, epidemic, and famine.

FRANK G. STOBIE

*The working plans for a new order  
based on peace and justice for all*

## A DYNAMIC WORLD ORDER

Donald A. MacLean

"His work is a product of this time of war . . . The up-to-dateness of (his) survey and the comprehensiveness of his vision are well displayed . . . There are courage and realism also . . . There is no grander object for the human mind than the dynamic world order on which Msgr. MacLean has written with wide knowledge."—  
Canadian Register

\$2.50

At your bookstore

**THE BRUCE PUBLISHING COMPANY**  
2811 MONTGOMERY BLDG. MILWAUKEE 1, WISCONSIN

## Current Editions!

Faulkner

4th Edition

### AMERICAN POLITICAL AND SOCIAL HISTORY

This new edition of Faulkner's widely-used text brings the story of American thought and action down to the late spring of 1945. A complete reappraisal of the Roosevelt Administrations, a new concluding chapter on our participation in the Second

World War, and a discussion of postwar problems are some of the features of this timely new revision. "This text is still my favorite."

—Edward C. Reilley, John Carroll University  
New maps and illustrations. 383 pages, \$4.00

Benns

6th Edition

### EUROPE SINCE 1914: In Its World Setting

Completely revised — this global history carries the story of Europe forward from 1914 to the German surrender and War in the Pacific in late spring, 1945. With Europe as focal point, significant developments in Asia, Africa, and the Americas have been given

new emphasis throughout the text to afford students a clear understanding of existing world relationships. "It is a splendid work."

—George K. Beuermann, St. John's University  
New maps and illustrations. 672+92 pages, \$4.00

For further information, write to:

**F. S. CROFTS & CO., 101 Fifth Avenue, New York 3, N. Y.**